

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

IN the letter which Professor SANDAY addressed to the Bishop of Oxford, a letter which went such a long way towards meeting the difficulties of present-day thought on miracle, there was one sentence that must have been peculiarly disappointing to the unbeliever in miracle. It was the sentence in which he expressed his heartfelt belief in the deity of our Lord.

How is it that Dr. SANDAY retains that belief, and retains it so assuredly? It is not with him a matter of custom or environment; it is not due to sentiment. No scholar of our day takes himself to task more sternly to see that his faith has reality to rest upon. As with all his beliefs, this also is due to his appreciation of the evidence. There is in the New Testament so much in favour of the deity of Christ, and that much is so powerfully strengthened by the record of Christian experience, that, when many things which once he believed have gone, this thing, the greatest of all, has remained to him and is more surely believed now than ever.

In a sermon preached in the Temple Church and reported in the new volume of *The Christian World Pulpit* (James Clarke & Co.; 4s. 6d.) Dr. SANDAY lifts a corner of the evidence which is offered by the New Testament. It is the evidence contained in the Synoptic Gospels. He

chooses the Synoptic Gospels because just on this very subject there is a difference between them and the Fourth Gospel. The Fourth Gospel has much to say about the deity of Christ, and says it directly. In the Synoptic Gospels the evidence is indirect, and, with one exception, it is found in small sayings or incidental allusions. For the Fourth Gospel was written with the express purpose of bringing out the deity of our Lord. The evangelist himself says so. He says, 'These are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.' The Synoptic Gospels are not entirely without this motive. But it is not prominent in them. It does not take the first place. It does not influence to the same degree the composition and form of their narratives. There is 'a great naturalness and simplicity' about them. And it is just this naturalness and simplicity that give value to the picture they present of the person of our Lord. It makes the light that they throw on His person more penetrating than that of the Fourth Gospel. It reveals Him more completely and more convincingly.

We are so familiar with the Christ of the Gospels that we do not see how unexpectedly natural He is. If we had written a Gospel we should have emphasized the things that appealed most powerfully to our minds. If we had tried to describe a Divine life upon earth we should have

taken good care that it should be seen at once to be Divine. We should have singled out the strongest expressions and put them in the strongest relief. The beauty of the Gospels is that they reflect the light as it really was; they do not force their own interests upon it. They leave it to tell its own tale.

The first example that Professor SANDAY takes is from the Gospel according to St. Mark. It is the familiar story of the healing of the palsied man who was let down through the roof of the crowded chamber by four of his friends. The Lord observed their faith, and gave the sick man the benefit of it. He said to him: 'Son, thy sins are forgiven thee.' But then He noticed that there were certain scribes sitting by, and that they were complaining, in an undertone, to each other: 'Why doth this man thus speak? he blasphemeth: who can forgive sins but one, even God?' The narrative goes on to tell how Jesus, perceiving in His spirit that they so reasoned within themselves said unto them: 'Why reason ye these things in your hearts? Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins (he saith to the sick of the palsy), I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy bed, and go thy way into thine house. And immediately he arose, took up the bed and went forth before them all; insomuch that they were all amazed and glorified God, saying, We never saw it on this fashion.'

Now this story makes one of the highest claims that ever were made by Jesus or for Him. It claims that He has power to forgive sins. But how is the claim made? It is made in a parenthesis. That which is the centre of the narrative, that which lifts Jesus high above all that is human, arises out of the story as a subordinate detail; a parenthesis is enough for it.

Quite as parenthetic, yet quite as amazing, is

the claim that is made when the Pharisees accuse Him of casting out demons through Beelzebub, the prince of the demons. He refutes that idea. And then He draws a lesson from the discussion. 'When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace: but when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him all his armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils.' The strong man armed is Satan, but our Lord leaves His audience to guess who is the stronger than he. And He says: 'If I by the finger of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you.' But He does not stay to press home the application to His own person; He contents Himself with saying that the victory over Satan is proof that the Kingdom is coming. He does not even point the obvious moral that He is the Prince and Ruler of that Kingdom. He leaves His hearers to draw the inference, but He does not draw it for them.

There is a still finer example in the immediate context. 'The men of Nineveh,' says Jesus, 'shall stand up in the judgement with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a greater than Jonah is here. The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgement with the men of this generation, and condemn them: for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold, a greater than Solomon is here.' Notice the indirect way in which Christ speaks of Himself. He does not use the first person, but the third. He does not say, 'I do this or that'; He says, 'The Son of Man does this or that.' The very title He uses seems to lay more emphasis upon His humanity than upon His divinity. And yet He had no doubt whatever in His own mind, and He does not leave His hearers in any doubt, as to the extent of His own implied claim of authority. He is well aware that His own coming marks an epoch in the history of the world such as had never been before: 'Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater

than John the Baptist, yet he that is but little in the kingdom of heaven (in that new order of things which He came to found) is greater than he.'

Dr. SANDAY said that to the reticence and reserve of the Synoptic Gospels on the Divinity there is one exception. It is the single verse: 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father; and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.' The verse is introduced most abruptly. We should expect so direct and lofty an announcement to be introduced by some preface, setting forth the uniqueness of this relation at some length, but there is none. It is possible, Dr. SANDAY thinks, and even probable, that the original saying was longer and fuller than we have it now. But the very abruptness of it is characteristic. It is a sentence full of a high theology, yet the Synoptists offer it just as they find it. The less suspicion attaches to it that it is unique. Its uniqueness is in keeping with the unstudied simplicity of these Gospels throughout.

But the uniqueness of this saying throws into contrast the general reserve of the first three Gospels. Professor SANDAY believes that we do not appreciate the delicacy of that reserve. It is a true reflexion of the reserve of Christ Himself. 'He came to manifest His glory, but it was a glory veiled, and not revealed, at least not revealed in the full blaze of His day. His sojourn upon earth was but the prelude to a great outpouring of the Spirit which has continued all down the ages, and is in full force even now.'

Of the things that are likely to emerge from the present upheaval one great thing is as likely as any other. It is that the East and the West will be drawn closer together. It is not merely that India and Great Britain will be drawn closer, or Great Britain and Japan. It is that all over the East and all over the West there is likely to be a new

and serious looking into those things which make them to differ, not in order to weaken them, but in order to appreciate and as far as possible appropriate them, to the great expansion and enrichment both of the West and of the East.

It is the more likely because the movement has been in progress for some time. In a notable article contributed to the issue for July of *The Calcutta Review* (Kegan Paul), G. F. BARBOUR, D.Phil., Esquire of Bonskeid, names one or two notable distinctions between typically Eastern and Western ways of thought, and points out certain lines of convergence which have already come into view. Two books lay before him as he wrote his article, one by an Eastern writer and one by a Western. The one book was *Sadhana: The Realization of Life*, being the Yale Lectures of Rabindranath Tagore. The other was a small volume containing three addresses by Emile Boutroux, called in French *L'Au-dela Intérieure*, in English *The Beyond that is Within*. These books draw the East and the West nearer. But, as we have said, Dr. BARBOUR tells us first of all wherein the East and the West most characteristically differ.

The simplest difference is also the most familiar. It is that Eastern thought is predominantly contemplative, while Western is predominantly practical. Dr. BARBOUR draws attention to the adverb 'predominantly,' for there are large and notable exceptions. On the side of the East he points to the practical genius of China and Japan; and how can we forget 'that little nation at the opposite extremity of the Asian continent, to which Europe owes its religion, and of which Matthew ARNOLD was thinking when he said that conduct was three parts of life'? And on the side of the West, while in the ancient, and still more in the modern, world the practical bent has been very strong, the contemplative ideal has never been wholly lost sight of and has had its periods of ascendancy, especially in the Middle Ages. Still the distinction holds good, and within its limits it is both useful and enlightening.

But there is a less familiar antithesis than that. It is the difference in the attitude of the East and the West towards the Infinite. The difference depends on the familiar difference of the contemplative and the practical already noticed. The practical mind looks with suspicion on any attempt to extend the flight of thought beyond the limits of clear definition and immediately verifiable knowledge. For the contemplative mind these limits exist only to be transcended.

To the practical mind of the Greek the 'Infinite' was an object almost of horror. It signified the unbounded, that which was without measure, and so the formless or chaotic. To the early mathematical philosophers of Greece the Infinite was the evil, the measured and symmetrical the good. The Greeks anticipated the saying of Goethe that 'he who would do great things must limit himself.' It was theirs to show that the highest beauty depends on a perfect command of the material medium and on a certain restraint in artistic expression. And in this interest they recognized the need of the work begun by Socrates, the work of criticizing the ideas which pass current in ordinary thinking. To the practical mind of the Greeks the infinite Beyond was only a distraction and a danger.

But even the Greek mind was not always practical. Greek philosophy and religion did not wholly lose the sense that concentration and 'measure' were not everything. Plato aspired after some single form of insight or knowledge in which all other knowledge is comprehended. And many a great thinker held that immediate inspiration might carry man into higher regions than the patient work of reason. Still, this is the mind of the East rather than of the West. In the words of Tagore, the ultimate truth about the external world "lies in our apprehension of the eternal will which works in time. . . . This is not mere knowledge, as science is, but it is a perception of the soul by the soul. This does not lead us to power, as knowledge does, but it gives us

joy, which is the product of the union of kindred things." But "to attain our world-consciousness, we have to unite our feeling with this all-pervasive infinite feeling." Here the Infinite is no longer an object of fear or aversion, but contact with it, nay more, the realization of the oneness of the human and the cosmic *atman* (surely one of the most daring conceptions ever reached), becomes the secret of all true understanding and of an abiding joy.'

How then are these two types of mind, so different in outlook, to be reconciled? Dr. BARBOUR does not claim that they can be reconciled. He claims only that the one may be brought to appreciate the other. He does not seem even to desire their reconciliation, in any sense that would mean coalescence. He believes that they have each a lasting value. His desire is that the East may obtain by understanding the benefit of that which is good in the practical scientific mind of the West; and perhaps still more earnestly, that the West may reap some of the riches which unquestionably attach to the more intuitive and imaginative mind of the East.

And to this end he commends the study, first of all, of M. BOUTROUX's little book. Not that M. BOUTROUX makes a deliberate and conscious attempt to understand the East. But his claim is the Eastern claim. He believes that the striving after a Beyond is an inextinguishable characteristic of the human spirit, and that it can find satisfaction only in a 'Beyond that is Within,' in the discovery of new depths in the inward and inalienable experiences of the heart of man.

Where do these experiences make themselves known? They make themselves known, says M. BOUTROUX, in Religion, in Morality, in Art, and even in Science. Dr. BARBOUR takes these four 'forms of life' separately, and considers how they point to and express the Beyond.

He takes Science first. The first great victories of modern science were gained by the strict appli-

cation of the mind to the things which can be measured, tested, and verified, and by the mental restraint which refused to look at those vague half-lights which come from the super-conscious world. But the time came when science could no longer be so restrained. Natural knowledge was found incapable of separation into measurable and conveniently limited departments. To do it justice a larger view had to be gained and subtler, bolder methods had to be used. Even in physics more and more reliance had to be placed upon mathematical theories which cannot be tested by direct observation, and in which concepts of the Infinite come to play an ever greater part. And when psychology made its researches into the phenomena of the sub-conscious—which some hold to be nearly allied to the super-conscious—a new meaning was read into the old motto: ‘Yet more is to be found in me.’ Thus science tends to become less positivist in tone and to rely more on hypotheses which can be verified only by the finest processes of the abstract intellect. It also reaches a fuller recognition of the infinite variety and complexity of the universe, and is thus less ready to dogmatize on the impassable limits of knowledge, more prepared to admit the impact of immeasurable influences on the mind of man.

Art, like Science, requires the discipline of concentration. ‘The path of beauty lies through a certain restraint and “economy,” through that perfect adaptation of form to idea, and banishment of all needless ornament which marked classical art at its best. But when this ideal has been approached, another and more sublime ideal is seen to lie beyond. The perfect expression of finite beauty no longer satisfies, and the artist strives to convey some hint or adumbration of an infinite beauty. Here, in the effort to express this transcendent idea, completeness and symmetry are no longer the one object of endeavour: it is found in the effort to express something of the “immortal longings” of the spirit of man.’

The same progress, and in the same direction, is

found in the history of Morality. First there is the stage of Law and legal observance. Duties may be numerous and exacting, but they are there, clearly set forth in custom or enactment, and there is no inherent reason why the good man should not say, ‘All these have I kept from my youth up.’ But gradually, as reflexion and self-knowledge grow deeper, a doubt arises whether goodness is exhausted by the performance of any outward law; and, as moral experience advances, this doubt becomes an assurance that the moral end cannot be thus attained, but that there is an element of the Infinite in the moral Ideal. This is the truth expressed by the Psalmist in the words, ‘Thy commandment is exceeding broad’; it underlies the discovery of Paul that ‘the law is spiritual’; and it has been writ large in modern ethical theory by Kant, who teaches that the ideal is so high and so exacting that it cannot be attained in this life, but implies a faith in immortality.

Finally, and in the words of M. BOUTROUX, as Dr. BARBOUR translates and quotes them, “Religion constitutes the endeavour to amplify, to enlarge, to transfigure the very foundations of our being, through that power which enables us to participate in an existence other than our own, and which strives to embrace even the infinite, *viz.*, love. And religion does really confer on nature the power of realizing what, from the naturalistic standpoint, was unrealizable. Religion pledges, in the innermost depths of the soul, the fundamental unity of the Given and of the Beyond, and she promises the gathering inflow of the latter into the former.” Nor is this true only in the region of effort and action; the great religious spirits have also expressed the same bold paradox of the relation of the finite spirit to the Infinite in terms of aspiration and desire. Such a religious paradox we find in the lines of Mary E. Coleridge:—

“Is this wide world not large enough to fill thee
Nor Nature, nor that deep man’s Nature, Art?
Are they too thin, too weak and poor to still
thee,
Thou little heart?”

Dust art thou, and to dust again returnest,
 A spark of fire within a beating clod.
 Should that be infinite for which thou burnest?
 Must it be God?"

What is the most distinctive thing about Christianity? What is it that gives Christianity its pre-eminence? What is it that distinguishes it utterly and for ever from all the religions of the world? It is that the followers of its Founder love Him.

It is not that He loves them. He does love them. 'Greater love hath no man than this.' But you might claim for Buddha, you might possibly claim for Muhammad, that they loved their followers. You cannot claim, however, that their followers love them. They did not love them even when they were with them on the earth. The wonder of Christianity is that Christians love the Lord Jesus Christ after He has gone to glory, that they love Him now as passionately as they loved Him at the beginning, that they are ready to lay down their lives for Him. That is what makes Christianity unique among the religions of the earth. That is what makes it *the* religion.

The idea is expressed and elaborated at length in a sermon by the Rev. W. E. ORCHARD, D.D., to be found in the volume already referred to of *The Christian World Pulpit*. The love of the soul for Jesus, says Dr. ORCHARD (who is one of our 'broad' theologians, remember), is unique in human experience. And he hints to the psychologist, so eagerly on the outlook for new material, that he should turn his attention to it. For, as we have said, it is a passionate love. It is that or it is nothing. Dr. ORCHARD dares even to refer it to the love that is between the sexes. The reference does not ignoble love to Jesus, which is purged from every base and even natural motive, but it ennoble sexual love, for it seems to show, he says, that sexuality and religious devotion have some obscure connexion.

It is a passion. It is not the love of abstract things like truth, sincerity, or justice. It is not even a hyperbole for spiritual adoration. It is a passion. It breaks into the poetry of passion in Bernard's 'Jesu, dulcis memoria,' and in Wesley's 'Jesu, Lover of my soul.' 'It takes up the Old Testament Song of Songs and reads into what is undoubtedly a romantic poem of pure though earthly love the sweet allegory of the sacred love between the soul and its Saviour. "I am my beloved's, and my beloved is mine." It seizes on David's elegy over Jonathan as expressing its own feelings. "His love to me was wonderful, passing the love of woman." It is a love which lays hold of strong, masterful men like Bernard, or Loyola, or Gordon, and makes them like little children. It sometimes provokes a scornful smile from those who cannot understand; but then so does the ridiculous behaviour of a young couple on a bus in the breast of the boisterous and unfeeling schoolboy, who nevertheless may soon be doing precisely the same thing.'

Love to Christ is that 'expulsive power of a new affection' which Chalmers declared to be the only thing which could break the tyranny of sin. 'It drew Augustine from the soft entanglements of sensuality, when all the religions and philosophies of the ancient world had failed to set him free, to mourn for ever the years in which he had not known Christ: "O beauty of ancient days, yet ever new, too late have I loved Thee." It drew Francis from the romance of chivalry, the delights of luxury, the frolics of youthful escapades, to become the knight of the Prince of Peace, the bridegroom of lady poverty, the troubadour of the lowly Jesus. It has just drawn Albert Schweitzer, the brilliant young German doctor, eminent musician, terrible theological critic, frequenter of Berlin salons, to the barbarism, the loneliness, the dangers of the fever-stricken Congo, to tell the natives the story of Jesus. Sodden drunkards, depraved criminals, worn-out *roués*, leering harlots, have become sober, honest, pure, clean, for love of Jesus.'

Thus does Dr. ORCHARD preach his sermon. We wonder sometimes if it is a sermon or a song. But as soon as we come to the 'heads'—the inevitable three—we do not doubt that the song is a true sermon. What are the three heads of it?

The first is that love to Jesus must be love to a real historical person. It is the Christ of our own experience that we love? Yes, but the Christ of our own experience is the Christ of Calvary. Can you bring a case where it is not? And when it goes back to Calvary, it finds a Christ who demanded love, love before everything else, love and nothing else.

The second head is that our love to Jesus goes back to Jesus' love for us. The question 'Lovest thou me?' (Jn 21¹⁷), which is Dr. ORCHARD's text, presupposes 'as I have loved thee.' It is meaningless without that. It is impertinent. 'We love because he first loved us.' Here again Dr. ORCHARD thinks there is material for the psychologist. And for the theologian. For 'He loved

me and gave himself for me'—that the follower of Jesus can say that, never having seen Jesus in the flesh, and find a response to that in the passion of his own heart's love for Jesus, is surely both psychology and theology the most profound.

The third head is that it takes us back to God. 'God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son'—it takes us back to that. For without that we cannot explain the love of Jesus. And without the love of Jesus to us, we cannot explain our love to Jesus, as we have already seen. It takes us back to the love of God, where the psychologist is at fault, and even the theologian is in deep perplexity. But of the fact there is no doubt whatever. It is a chain. We know that God loves us because we love Jesus. His disciples might have loved Him because they found Him as a man well worthy of their love. But we who have not seen Him in the flesh could not love Him so. We could not love Him if He were not the Son of God. We could not love Him if it were not true that God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son.

The Theology of Paul and the Teaching of Jesus Christ.

BY REV. J. G. JAMES, M.A., D.LITT., NEW BARNET.

WE are frequently being told that the theology of St. Paul as propounded in his Epistles is a hindrance rather than a help to those who would take the gospel of Jesus our Lord in all its directness and simplicity to their hearts. In one form or another this objection has been urged since the cry, 'The Return to Christ' was raised, and long before the Tübingen School came into being. The later developments in theology have brought it once more to the front, and we are continually hearing echoes of the same cry, that Paul corrupted the simplicity of the truth as it is in Jesus. Renan has thus stated the charge. 'The writings of Paul have been a stumbling-block and a peril; they have caused the chief defects in Christian

theology. Paul is the father of the subtle Augustine, the arid Aquinas, the sombre Calvinist, the sour Jansenist, and the ferocious theology which predestinates to damnation. Jesus is the father of those who seek repose for their souls in the dreams of the ideal world.'

It is really worth our while to look at this contention fairly and to consider what degree of truth there is in it. In so doing we may be enabled to bring out the distinctive value of Paul's testimony and the contribution he has made to religious truth. English writers do not as a rule seem to have taken a prominent place in this vital discussion, which has been going on now for some years; but it is a subject upon which every careful

and intelligent reader of the N.T. may come to a definite conclusion for himself.

Let us start with Arnold Meyer's statement of the case. He represents our Lord in the whole of His life and teaching as being perfectly simple and consistent, propounding the deepest truths as if no one could possibly doubt or question them. He appeals to nature and to human life; He judges by the instincts of His own good life and expects others to do the same. He has no system, no definite theology, no dogma of human depravity, no plan of salvation. God is near to every one who says to Him, 'Our Father.' With joy He promises in God's name the forgiveness of sins to all who repent and He never makes the additional demand of faith in the propitiatory sacrifice of His death. The only propitiation He knows is repentance and conversion. Our Lord can feel all confidence in the simple religious soul, even in the sinner who in penitence seeks after God.

Paul's doctrines form a striking contrast to all this. He is said to have had an entirely different conception of God. Like an Oriental ruler God displays the qualities of despotism and caprice. He can approach men only through His Son. If He would love His enemies and reach out His hand to them, He requires the propitiatory shedding of blood. Christ has died and risen again in order to bring men to God, and all that He has suffered and all that He has done had been planned beforehand for the redemption of men. This is Meyer's statement of the soteriology of Paul, and he calls it a theological drama, in which Christ plays the assigned part, and thus lost and helpless souls pass on to receive the foreordained doom of condemnation or grace.

Let me further quote from Wrede. In Jesus everything aims at the personal character of the individual. In Paul the central point is a divine act, in history, but transcending history, or a complex of such acts, which imparts to mankind a ready-made salvation. Whoever believes in these divine acts—the incarnation, the death and resurrection of a celestial being—receives salvation. This to Paul, says Wrede, is the sum of religion.

These are typical statements of a certain school of thought which I imagine most of us would condemn as being, to say the least, extreme. But whilst we should shrink from endorsing such sentiments as these, there are many amongst us who question whether Paul's theology has not made it

more difficult than otherwise for simple souls to accept the gospel, and who think it would be a distinct gain if men were content to leave Paul's theories severely alone, or at any rate hand them over to theologians to deal with, whilst adhering closely to the teachings of Jesus and especially to accept the revelation given by our Lord to men of God as their Father, with all that the doctrine of the Fatherhood involves. There has been a determined effort of late years to dissociate Jesus from Christianity as a system or a cult, and to lay upon Paul the responsibility of encumbering the religion of Jesus with an incubus of dogma which all succeeding ages have been engaged in unravelling and attempting to explain.

In the first place it is perhaps desirable to indicate in brief the point of contact between Paul and our Lord and to show how far the Apostle was influenced directly or indirectly by the teachings, the life, and the death and resurrection of his Master.

The question with some critics is not how much of Christ's teaching is to be discovered in Paul's Epistles and how far he was influenced by the materials that we find in the Synoptics, or in Q and Ur-Mark, but whether the Synoptics themselves were not influenced by Paulinism, inasmuch as they may have been produced later than the Epistles. On the surface of it this hypothesis looks absurd or as begging the whole question. The answer to this position seems to me to be that if the Gospels were under the influence of Paulinism at all they would have been much more so than they obviously are. This extreme position may, I think, be safely ignored in this paper.

A careful comparison of the Epistles of Paul with the Synoptics will yield probably far more striking evidences of Paul's knowledge of his Master than one might have suspected. And it is permissible to suppose that Paul passed over many of the details of our Lord's life and ministry in order to give the full significance of His death and resurrection and to explain the far-reaching and universal import of these facts for humanity and in the redemption of the race. It was surely not necessary for him to tell all that he knew about Jesus at a time when these facts would be known and accepted by all. At any rate he gave ample evidence that at least he knew that Jesus was 'a man' born of a woman, of the family of David, as wholly submissive to the Father's will, as worthy of the imita-

tion of all in that He pleased not Himself, that He instituted the last supper, that He was betrayed to death, and that on the third day He was raised from the dead and thereby declared to be the Son of God with power. This outline of facts seems to have been perfectly familiar to the apostle together with several of our Lord's specific teachings.

Nor are we to suppose that Paul claims to have received all his knowledge of Christ by direct revelation, without any kind of communication from the rest of the disciples. The facts connected with human redemption were a matter of common knowledge although the message of the gospel both for his own heart and for deliverance to the nations was doubtless received directly from the Lord Himself. None of the events connected with Jesus differed in any substantial manner from what we find recorded in the Synoptics, and we may well suppose that he received them through the ordinary channels of information.

May I be permitted to say in passing that I am not at all sure, in spite of the opinion of many eminent authorities, that Paul did not know Jesus personally in His earthly ministry? One is inclined to ask where Paul was during the course of the great tragedy which took place at Jerusalem. He was on the spot shortly afterwards and he may have witnessed and heard more than we give him credit for. I am inclined to agree with Johannes Weiss in regarding the passage in 2 Co 5¹⁶ as a practical admission that Paul did know Jesus after the flesh, but that he was not disposed to lay any stress upon the fact. It was rather that Christ knew *him*—knew him to be a true disciple and a new creature that really mattered. At one time he had been an enemy of Christ, but now he could claim to be an apostle equally with any of them.

Whether this position be accepted or not we may confidently affirm that Paul had every right to speak of himself as an apostle of our Lord, that he believed in Jesus Christ as the Son of God his Saviour, and that he deliberately set himself to carry out his Master's intentions, preaching the gospel of the grace of God in Christ's own spirit and with his Lord's approval. Feine very properly shows that Paul was familiar with the words and thoughts of the historic Christ, and in eschatology, the doctrine of redemption, in ethics, in his attitude towards the Law, his conception of baptism and in the Lord's Supper, he only carries to a further point of development what was already

embraced or implied within the teaching of our Lord Himself. Paul would not regard himself in any other light than as a servant of Christ, as His apostle, and his one effort was to know and proclaim his Lord. Paul had grasped the full meaning of Christ's ministry, and Christ was henceforth the aim and meaning of his whole being.

Whilst Feine and many others have so clearly expressed this as being the aim and intention of the Apostle, what are we to think of the apparently well-marked differences in the theology of Paul as compared with the gospel of Jesus? May he not have been unconsciously and unwittingly under other influences, and so have been the cause of divergences of which he himself was not aware? With the best possible intentions, may he not have started trains of thought and doctrine which were not in complete harmony with the simple teaching of his Lord?

It is so often asserted that Paul was under the influence of the Rabbinical Schools of thought that it is unnecessary for me to enter into the discussion of this point with any extended reference. He declares that he was advanced in the Jews' religion beyond many of his own age among his countrymen, that he was more exceedingly zealous for the traditions of his fathers, as touching the law a Pharisee, and that he was a Hebrew of the Hebrews. His frequent references to the words of the O.T., his quotations from the Book of Wisdom, his habit of referring to the sacred text, and his mode of reasoning are all suggestive of the Jewish Rabbi. As such he was well acquainted with the eschatological, the Messianic, and the apocalyptic ideas of his time, and was quite familiar with the doctrines that centred in the conception of the 'heavenly man.' The whole of his polemical and apologetic methods were those of the cultured and up-to-date Rabbi. This has been very largely the ground of the objection and even of reproach brought against Paul, that he has introduced far too much of the ideas and the methods of the Rabbinical Schools into the theology of the Christian religion.

Let me say what I fear will lay me open to somewhat severe criticism. I believe that Paul was far more largely under Hellenistic influences than has been generally allowed, and that he cannot be fully understood unless we give full consideration to this matter.

The very fact that Paul felt compelled on several

occasions to make such strong and emphatic declarations of his Hebrew origin and Rabbinical connexions suggests that for very good reasons he felt it necessary to do so, because in the eyes of many persons it must have seemed otherwise. It is true that he was on each occasion indicating what he had given up for Christ, but surely the Tarsian convert would have been suspect in the eyes of the stricter Pharisaical Schools; and it was necessary in consequence to state his standing in relation to the Law.

When we say that Paul was under the influence of Hellenism, what do we mean? Hellenism stood for the fusion of races, the unity of language, the union of cities and other political entities into one great harmony, and, above all, it stood for religious toleration. That Paul had every opportunity of coming under these influences and that he had some sympathy with these movements is undeniable. Paul was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, a teacher whose breadth of vision is well known, as also the fact that he advised his pupils to study Greek literature. Tarsus, his birthplace, was the seat of the most thoroughgoing Greek culture of that day, and it affords the one example in history in which a state was ruled by the successive principals of its university. Sir W. M. Ramsay affirms that 'it was the one city which was suited by its equipoise between the Asiatic and the Western spirit to mould the character of the great Hellenistic Jew; and that it nourished in him a strong sense of loyalty and patriotism as the "citizen of no mean city"' (*The Cities of St. Paul*, p. 235).

There are abundant linguistic evidences that Paul was thoroughly conversant with the Greek literature of his day. He quotes Menander in 1 Co 15²³, 'Evil company doth corrupt good manners'; Aratus, or more probably Cleanthes, in Ac 17²⁸, 'We are also his offspring'; and Epimenides in Tit 1¹², 'Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, idle gluttons.' His metaphors are Greek in regard to the mysteries (Col 1²⁶, Ph 4¹²), the life of the citizen—'commonwealth, fellow-citizens' (Eph 2¹²⁻¹⁹), and education—'tutor' or 'schoolmaster' (Gal 3²⁴). Paul's frequent use of the term 'conscience,' which is found so seldom elsewhere in the N.T., is quite a Stoic conception. His moral teaching takes up the best thoughts of Greek philosophy. In 1 Co 4⁸ he uses the Stoic phrases, and in Col 1 it is said by Weiss that the expressions in which Paul clothes his ideas (with regard to 'the image of the invisible

God,' 'the first-born of every creature,' etc.) are entirely Greek and were borrowed from the Stoic School. The Stoics laid great stress upon the law of nature; Paul employs the term quite in harmony with their usage. He uses delicate distinctions as *μορφή* and *σχήμα* in referring to the Person of Christ (Ph 2^{6, 7, 8}), and his terms for spirit, soul, nature, etc., are thoroughly psychological. The great lyric in 1 Co 13, which has been termed the 'love-song of the Church,' has been adduced by Dr. Andrews as an instance of the strong vein of poetry which is to be found in Paul's nature. On the other hand, Canon Hicks says that it irresistibly reminds him of Aristotle's Nicomachæan Ethics! Perhaps we may reconcile these two authorities by saying that the highest flights of philosophy are indistinguishable from poetry, and all true poetry is philosophy. Several passages in Paul remind one of the Nicomachæan Ethics. The beautiful passage in 2 Co 5⁴ referring to the process of being clothed upon of immortality has an almost exact parallel in Aristotle (*N.E.* x. vii. 1177^b, 33).

Several modern writers, particularly Schweitzer, will not allow that there is much in this contention, asserting that Paul had no first-hand acquaintance with the classic authors, but that his Hellenism came to him through the Alexandrine influences. But to me it seems highly important. We know that Jesus employed figures and parables that were decidedly Oriental and Syrian, but Paul found himself within, and had to deal with, an almost entirely different world, a world later in time and, as Asia Minor was, saturated with Greek thought. The gospel came in Jewish garb, or perhaps we should say in Oriental garb, but it had to pass through the thought-forms and the language of the Greeks, the most suitable medium, as the colloquial Greek was, for the people of that day with whom Paul had to deal. Indeed, I am inclined to go so far as to think that Paul's mystical sayings bear a far richer significance if we are permitted to read them in the thought-forms of the Platonic Idealism, with which I cannot think that Paul was wholly unacquainted. Mr. Claude G. Montefiore in his book on *Judaism and St. Paul* says that the Apostle was no Rabbinical Jew and that he did not really understand the Law, excepting in its fetters. Sir William M. Ramsay has stated the case very strongly when he asserts that it is 'unintelligible how so many distinguished

scholars in modern times can read his letters and continue to maintain that he was a narrow Jew, ignorant of Hellenic thought and training' (*The Cities of St. Paul*, p. 434).

However this may be, we may be sure that Paul owed nothing either to Hellenic thought or Rabbinical tradition for the gospel which he preached. His message was received direct from his Lord. Nevertheless he owed a great deal to both for his modes of expression and as the medium for conveying the truths of the redeeming love of God in Christ—truths that are of equal importance for Jew and Greek, barbarian and free.

At the present time a great deal is being written with the purpose of showing that early Christianity owes much of its teachings and all the principal events of our Lord's life and ministry, His death and resurrection to the influence of the cults of that age and especially to the Mystery Religions, and that Paul derived all his ideas with regard to the sacraments from these sources. There can, I think, be little doubt that the Apostle manifests a full acquaintance with these mysteries and that many of his conceptions were framed with these cults in view. So far as we know what the mystery religions actually taught, it seems that they were so crude and almost revolting, and devoid of moral force and dignity, that one wonders how they could have been compared with the gospel story or the teachings of Paul. We can understand that Paul referred implicitly to these esoteric teachings to point the contrast between them and the supreme mystery of godliness. Nor have I any sympathy with Weinelt's view that we have in Paul two forms of religion, the one sacramental and the other spiritual, standing side by side, without any attempt at co-ordination. He asserts that the sacramental element was derived from the mystery religions and has become through the ages the basis and the justification for all the distinctive Catholic doctrines. If these two irreconcilable elements really exist in St. Paul's teachings, which I very much doubt, either of the two would have destroyed the other in the experience of a mind so logical and well balanced as that of the Apostle.

Now we come to what is specifically the main point of this paper. In what respects does Paulinism differ from the essential gospel truths as taught by Jesus Christ, and what do these differences involve?

Let us observe that whilst Paul received his gospel from Christ Himself and would admit no possibility of there being another Gospel, his work and mission were entirely different from those of his Master. Paul's distinctive work was to present the gospel to the nations and the Gentiles, and to show that they had the same claim to the benefits of Christ's redemptive work as the Jews. The ministry of Jesus was especially and almost exclusively confined to the chosen people. He was not sent but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel. These were to have the first chance in the offer of salvation through God's mercy and grace. But in order to do this our Lord has to take the Law, which was their especial gift and sacred deposit from God, and unfold its true and full meaning extensively and intensively. By enforcing its true inwardness and its spiritual significance He was demonstrating the fact that He had not come to destroy but to fulfil the Law and the Prophets. This was precisely what the Hebrew people, especially the scribes and the Pharisees, could not or would not apprehend, hence their rejection of a Teacher so penetrative and so searching. He came to fulfil the Law and the Prophets, and never said a word about abrogating or setting aside the Mosaic code. What their own Law, revered and almost worshipped by them, really meant was precisely that which the Hebrew nation required to know.

Paul took up the same attitude as his Master with respect to the moral claims of the Law. To him love was the fulfilling of the Law. He almost repeated the very words of Christ when he said that He had fulfilled the Law for us, and that Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believes. But what about 'the lesser breeds without the Law?' His mission, unlike that of his Master, was especially to them. The standing before God of both Jew and Gentile was by faith and not by the works of the Law. It was faith which led to obedience that was the sole ground of justification before God for the Jew no less than for the Gentile. The Jew was not saved simply because his race was included within the scope of the covenant or because he possessed the Law. It was because, as a truly spiritual child of Abraham, he exercised faith in the God of the covenant. Christ, he argued, had fulfilled and satisfied the Law for all, and therefore the Gentiles were put in precisely the same

position before God as the Jews. In Christ Jesus all are one, neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation. Neither Jew nor Greek could keep the Law in its entirety. All alike were condemned and included under sin in order that all might alike share in the covenant of grace. Weinel has well expressed the matter. 'The two roads to salvation are therefore descent from Abraham and justification. . . . The experience of his life showed him that the road of righteousness was an impossible one. No one can acquire so much righteousness of his own as to be quite sure of God's acquittal. Rather all men are sinners, Gentiles as well as Jews, and both are condemned by the law itself, the former by the law which is written in their own hearts, the latter by the detailed laws of Moses. All are sinners, and all therefore have come short of the heavenly glory of God. There is no righteous man; no, not one. Neither amongst the Gentiles, nor among the children of Abraham. All alike deserve to go to hell.'

All this reasoning, which appears to so many people to be unnecessarily intricate and which is regarded as a corruption of the simplicity of the gospel, was designed to make it perfectly clear for those who were outside the borders of the chosen race that they equally with the Jews could claim the benefits of Christ's redemptive work. Paul was but applying to the people of his day the scope of the profound utterance of our Lord, 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life.' As an answer to those who sought to re-impose the Mosaic ritual upon Gentile Christians this reasoning was most effective and conclusive. Paul was not, in his elaborate arguments in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, encumbering the gospel with speculations of his own, still less was he importing Rabbinical conceptions and limiting ideas into his message. On the contrary, he was endeavouring to demonstrate the liberty of the gospel and freedom from the Law. He was universalizing the religion of Jesus, and was indicating the basis upon which that universality rested. In giving the true universal significance to the gospel message he was merely setting forth and developing his Master's own teaching and applying it altogether in harmony with his Master's intention. He thus

not only attempted to free the Christian religion from the limitations of the Jewish faith, but actually succeeded in doing so. Jesus had pronounced Woes against the lawyers of His time because they shut up the kingdom of God against men, Paul in the Galatians attacked the lawyers and also the Law because it set up a barrier between Jews and Gentiles. It is passing strange that Jesus, as He said, came to fulfil the Law, but made it so spiritual in its connotation that He was condemned for doing violence to it; on the other hand, Paul, who demonstrated that the Law was rendered of none effect, has through the centuries been accused of being a legalist!

It was the Rabbinical element in Paul that led him to narrow the scope of salvation, to oppose Jesus Christ, and to persecute the Church. When Christ had set him free from the Law, what a freedom was that! He was released for all those glorious activities which gave full play to what was best in Hellenistic aspirations, a kingdom of God with world-wide intention, that would break down the partition between the nations as well as give full religious and spiritual freedom.

Nor must it be forgotten that in all his teaching Paul was speaking directly out of his own experience to those who needed special help, the very help which Paul was commissioned to give. Dr. Andrews in his invaluable little book, *The Value of the Theology of St. Paul for Modern Thought*, has made this fact perfectly clear, and he rightly maintains that no one can understand Paul, the theologian and apostle, who does not study Paul, the man. Paul had found that his own mystic union with Christ, his Saviour and Lord, had brought to his soul the satisfaction and peace which the most punctilious observance of the Law had never afforded. And it was when he was brought face to face with the problems which arose out of the conflict with Judaizing teachers and all that was opposed to his universalistic schemes and the wideness of God's mercy that he elaborated his theological system which we find unfolded in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians.

Let us pass to the consideration on broad lines of the relations of morality and religion as set forth by Paul, as compared with those of Jesus Christ. It is here where many people conceive the greatest divergence to lie, but where, as it seems to me, the greatest harmony exists. The

contrast is often presented as that of the ethical teaching of Jesus with the speculative thought of Paul. But where is really the meeting-place of ethics and religion? Is it not in pure and holy love, love to God and man based upon the experience of God's forgiving love to us in Christ? In this respect the Apostle and his Master are absolutely at one. On the two commandments of love, said the Master, hang all the Law and the Prophets. Paul ever maintained that love is the fulfilling of the Law. The parables of our Lord emphasized the importance of love in its practical expression, and yet Paul was applying the same principle of love in quite another set of circumstances to actual cases, when he insisted that a newly found Christian liberty was not to be used in such a way as to cause a brother to stumble or to be made weak. It may be urged that Paul laid more stress upon faith in the finished work of Christ than he did upon love, whilst Jesus made love the ground of approach. Still, it must not be forgotten that Jesus always insisted upon the full acceptance of Himself in faith and His words by obedience as the necessary conditions of any spiritual blessing. Paul's great Ode to Love, in which faith and hope are subordinated to love, to say nothing of other great spiritual gifts, could never have been written by one who was hide-bound with Rabbinical lore or theological pre-occupations. Love was for him the life-blood of all morality and religion, it overleaped all the barriers of time and place and circumstance, it was 'the more excellent way.' This teaching was the transcript and reflex of his own life and character; one has only to think of what he suffered in the interests of others and for his Master's sake to realize the truth of this statement. As Weiss has pointed out, the emphasis laid upon love indicates that in this respect Paul understood Jesus 'inwardly, deeply, and correctly.' Those who speak of the ethical teaching of Jesus so as to imply that Paul had no ethical teaching must surely have forgotten Ro. 14, in which the Sermon on the Mount is brought to bear upon the specific needs of the Romans of Paul's day. The ethic of Paul, as Weiss has so fully and admirably shown, is an invaluable contribution to the totality of Christian morality. Men are taught that they must not retaliate; it is better to suffer wrong than to inflict it. The non-resistance of one who loves God and

his fellows is inspired by a divine and fine contempt for the powers of evil. Men are to bear the misfortunes of life in a brave and cheerful spirit, anxious for nothing but to do the will of God, and committing all else to the ordering of the Heavenly Father's wisdom and love. They are to please not themselves, but their brother for his good to edification. All this is in complete harmony with the Master's own spirit. Where minor points of difference occur it will be noticed that Paul was dealing with a different set of conditions; and it must ever be borne in mind that Paul had the task of organizing Christian communities, whilst his Master was dealing with individuals and was inaugurating the kingdom.

I can quite believe that some of my readers may ask why I have not dealt with two of the distinctive doctrines of Paul, viz. original sin and predestination. It must be said in reply that either one of these would take more than the whole of the space that I have at my disposal for this paper. With regard to the former, one need hardly do more than point out that, whatever view of the subject we adopt, original sin takes its place in Paul's great argument that the whole race needs redemption as a race, and that none can stand before God on the ground of merit. As therefore the race needs to be redeemed, Christ is a perfect Saviour by offering a cosmic sacrifice and propitiation by His death. Likewise with regard to predestination, assuming that it is true that God's people are the chosen and elected, yet, as Paul argues, that very election is grounded in the mercy and the free grace of God. So that for all the nations, the Gentiles as well as the Hebrews, the gift of salvation is freely bestowed, and the new covenant of grace may include all. It should not be forgotten that the germs of both these doctrines are found in the teaching of the Master Himself.

There is, of course, one essential difference between Paul and Jesus, and that was precisely the difference which we should expect to find between the disciple and his Master, the sinner and his Saviour. That is the spirit of reverence, dependence, and faith in Christ which runs through the whole of Paul's life and teaching. With all his fulness of utterance and with all the grateful adoration of the Apostle for his Lord, we cannot but feel that the underlying thought is too deep for expression, feelings that broke through language

and escaped, when he sought to convey to others all that Christ meant for him.

It is here, as it seems to me, that the thought-forms of the Platonic philosophy came to his help, although Paul was expressing what far transcended the Platonic or any other philosophy. More than all that Plato meant in his doctrine of ideals we have in Philippians, where Paul sets His Lord before him as the prize, the mark, and the goal of the whole of his vital activity. Christ was to him the reality of the personal Ideal, to whose form and likeness he had to approximate more and more. Christ was to him his highest good, the purpose and aim as well as the significance of his whole being. He longed to be found in Him, not having his own righteousness, but the righteousness which is of God through faith. His life was hid with Christ in God, and yet he could say, 'I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.' Paul felt that his vital interest, his true being, was not in himself, the actual sinful Paul, but in his Ideal, his Lord. In this mystic union of Paul with Christ there was no Pantheistic tendency, no blending or confusion of the centres of personal entity, but it was a conception of the Christ as the Ideal, who, whilst being the end and the fulfilment of his soul's aspiration and the object of his faith, was being formed in him, and who was shaping and moulding his life and character, and upon whose personality, death and resurrection, his whole life was being formed and modelled. Thus could he say that his life was to be found in Christ and Christ in him. This is not the *unio mystica* of the mystery religions, but an ethical union, as Professor Pringle Pattison has said, constituted by love and mediated through faith. Whilst the form may have been Platonic, the content was the living Gospel of his Lord, nay, the very Christ Himself. Whilst the revelation came to his soul through the immediacy of faith he acknowledged that he owed the whole of his message to Jesus the crucified, who was still living in all His resurrection power as his Saviour and his Lord.

The theology of Paul, therefore, was intended for distinctly practical purposes in regulating, instructing, and organizing the Churches which he had formed or in which he was specially interested.

It was not an attempt to formulate in precise terms the dogmas of the Christian Church, and yet it has been the basis of all theological thought in the ages since. Moreover the theology of Paul has always been associated with every great movement of the Church in Evangelical fervour and enthusiasm. One has only to claim for Paul a deeper study of his doctrines in the light of his own personal experience to discern that he was in spirit nearer to his Lord than one might have thought. 'He who would understand Paul aright,' one has said, 'should seek to find him at the height of his ideal, and then he would discover that he is not far distant from Jesus.' He enlarged upon and sought to explain the redemptive work of Christ, its far-reaching scope and its universality. He indicated its bearing upon the needs of humanity, man's sinfulness and his capacity for knowing and serving God in Christ and finding life eternal. But in all this he was expanding and interpreting our Lord's own declaration that He came to give His life a ransom for many, and all the doctrines of redemption centred in that supreme act of self-sacrifice which in reality had a larger content of truth than all the doctrines and dogmas could elucidate. This was Paul's theme, and to the exposition of it he devoted his whole life until the time came for him to lay that life down for the Master's sake and to go to be with his Lord, and receive the crown of righteousness.

The leading characteristic of Paul's teaching was that he owed all that he was to Christ, his Lord. Christ in His perfect holiness, Paul through Christ's redemptive work, Christ in His eternal Sonship, Paul through the grace of God, Christ as the manifestation of the infinitely holy love of the Father, Paul by means of that unspeakable love that chose and singled him out, Christ as the Saviour and Lord, Paul the Apostle, were infinitely removed the one from the other, and yet at the same time were in vital relation and perfect union. Meyer has splendidly expressed it when he said, "Back to Jesus from Paul," does not express what is required of us, but our motto should be, "Back through Paul to Jesus and God," and our conclusion, "Paul just one who points the way to Jesus and God."

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

THE HAND.

'The hand of man.'—Gn 9⁵.

1. *Hands*.—I have a very distinct recollection of three pairs of hands. They were the hands of my brothers. Long ago, when we played together, I never noticed that there was any great difference between the hands of the four of us. It was not till we grew up, and each had his own distinctive characteristics, that the difference struck me. I can imagine I see them now; and if they were held up amongst twenty other pairs, I believe I could pick them out. You are not grown up yet, so I don't suppose you have thought about hands and what they mean. But your mother knows ever so much about yours. I've seen a very proud mother holding a baby boy; and when he closed his wee hand firmly, she said, 'See! that's going to be a man with some force about him.' It is really very delightful to hear mothers on this subject.

But, while you have never given the matter a thought, you must have noticed certain things. For instance, the hands of a labouring man are not in the least like those of a watchmaker, or an engraver, or of a person who writes all day. And some of you little ones, who get your faces washed, know that there are very hard hands, as well as nice soft ones. A real nurse's hand is both strong and soft. A doctor's may be the same, but it must also have a very delicate touch. Then perhaps some of the boys have seen men who had tremendous strength in their hands. There is a well known cartoon of the German Emperor, called the 'Mailed Fist.' He is holding up a clenched hand covered with iron. But it was just a boy of whom we are told in the Bible that he killed both a lion and a bear. How strong his hand must have been! It was delicate as well; for—think of it—that boy could play the harp most beautifully. Sculptors have often tried to represent him in marble, sometimes as a boy, oftener as a man. But with their cold dead medium, they could never show us the living hand of the Bible. Read the story of David again to-night, and you will, in your mind, have a picture of that hand, comforting the unhappy king with music. Then, picture it to

yourselves clenched as he led on his army to battle, and again, covering his face as he wept for Absalom. With us older people, David's hand is oftenest remembered as having something of the little child in it; for when it was lifted up before God, it was to say, 'I've done wrong: forgive me' ('I have sinned . . . take away the iniquity of thy servant').

2. *Her hand*.—You remember the first hand you ever noticed? It was your mother's, wasn't it? You know every line and mark upon it—the first finger of the left hand, with the marks that the needle has made, the knuckles—perhaps they tell of hard work—and the palm. You never saw a hand quite like it. It can do all sorts of things—brush your hair, iron the frocks for the picnics, perhaps even scrub the floors. There have been men who, when they were away in foreign countries, loved to think of that hand. It comforted them. And there have been others who could not bear to think of it. They had done what was wrong, and felt they could not look their mother in the face.

3. *My hand*.—Now, there's your own hand—'my hand.' It has a little history written on it already. The mark of that cut you got two years ago, and that big joint on your forefinger—it was caused by a chilblain. But these are just trifles. Speaking seriously; what is your hand for? For service—for doing things with. Who is its master or mistress? You are. No wonder, then, that the hand is mentioned in the Bible oftener than almost anything else; for the Bible is just written about men, women, and boys, and girls; what they do, and how they are rewarded or punished. It is, in fact, a great book about the hands. Think of this yourselves. Each of you has a pair. They may, at your bidding, do either good or evil. *They are really yourselves*. If you have a careless mind, then, according to the Bible, your hand is the same. It speaks of 'the hand of the diligent,' the 'slack hand,' 'clean hands,' the hand that is 'cruel' and the hand 'stretched out to help.' There's a hand I should like to speak to the girls about. It is an old-fashioned, but a very beautiful one—the hand of the virtuous woman. 'She stretcheth out her hand to the poor; yea, she reacheth forth her hands to the needy.' I wonder, girls, if any of you

have begun to learn drawing. It is when you try to draw a woman's hand that you discover how beautiful it may be. I remember once seeing a letter written to a girl by one who loved her very, very much. The only sentence in it that I can recall now is, 'I cannot think of that pretty little hand ever doing anything but kind actions.'

4. *His hand.*—A few years ago I went to see an interesting church with a lady. We had been out a walk together and had talked to each other just about ordinary everyday things. But in the church was a picture of Jesus Christ. As soon as my companion saw it, in deepest reverence she knelt down to pray. And a feeling like that comes when one tries to think of 'His hand.'

We hesitate to speak, lest we spoil the marvellous story of the New Testament. From beginning to end it is a story of love. 'Jesus put forth his hand'; 'He laid his hands on them' (you remember that was when the little children were brought to Him); 'He took her by the hand.'

I know what many of you thought of when I came to this part of our sermon. My dear children, it was the *hands* of men that raised the cross. But there were those whose eyes had been opened to know Jesus Christ. They loved Him, and were His devoted followers. Between them and their Master there was a beautiful friendship, deepened no doubt during the days following the resurrection, for then there was an element of sorrow in it. Even in the joy of seeing Him again, they must have felt sad, for 'he shewed unto them his hands.' If you heard of a life like the life of Jesus Christ being lived now, wouldn't you, like young soldiers, be ready with your right hands to take an oath of allegiance to him who lived it? And were your fathers and mothers but willing, I believe you would follow such a man to the ends of the earth. You can enter the service of Jesus Christ now.

THE CARPENTER'S SHOP.

'Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us?'—Mt 13^{55, 56}.

1. Carpentry is a very ancient trade. Long before the time of Christ there were joiners and carpenters in Egypt, Assyria, Persia, and Greece, who could do beautiful work and had invented a

variety of tools, as we can tell by those which have been discovered. Carpenters are sometimes mentioned in the Bible. The prophet Isaiah describes a carpenter who cuts down a tree, and makes the figure of a man out of it for an idol, which he falls down and worships, and of the rest of the tree he makes a fire to warm himself, and to bake his bread and cook his meat on. His 'heart is deceived' so that he does not see how foolish it is to make a god out of the piece of wood which he burns. We see the folly of it, but we must remember that it is done still in many places.

Then there were the carpenters who worked for king Solomon. He got them from the king of Tyre, because they were more clever than his own. King Hiram gave him wood as well, cedar trees and fir trees, and the carpenters, along with those of king Solomon, made the wood-work of the Temple and of the king's palaces. All the inside of the Temple was lined with cedar wood, carved with flowers and cherubim and palm trees, and the doors were made of olive wood carved in the same way, and then it was all covered over with gold. And in Solomon's own palace there was one hall which had rows upon rows of pillars all made of cedar, so that it was called the House of the Forest of Lebanon. All this was the work of the carpenters.

In our own land we find that the ancient fraternity of English carpenters existed in the time of Edward IV., while those of the 'joiners and ceilers,' whose motto is the honest one, 'Join truth with trust,' were not incorporated until the reign of Elizabeth. Their old hall, near London Wall, one of the few large city buildings which escaped destruction during the Great Fire of London, still has in it some curious Biblical frescoes representing the first workers in wood: Noah humbly listening to the Lord's commands concerning the building of the Ark, and in another part of the same picture are shown the patriarch's three sons all busy at the task; we have king Josiah directing the repairs of the Temple, or Joseph working in his carpenter's shop at Nazareth, the crowd wondering concerning the new teacher—'Is not this the carpenter's son?'—the subject of each picture being made clear by black-letter inscriptions.¹

2. Not only in temples and palaces, however, but wherever people live, workers in wood are needed. Houses must have doors, and fishermen must have boats, and the boats must have masts and oars. In Palestine the ploughs and yokes and goads and other agricultural implements were made of wood, and were the work of the carpenter.

¹ C. L. Matéaux, *Wonderland of Work*, 146.

And if it was a humble trade, it was considered an honourable one, and a carpenter could be chosen as High Priest.

The carpenter in Palestine was not a man who merely made articles in a workshop, but one who went about the district repairing doors and windows, going sometimes as far as the lake, twenty-five miles off, to repair boats and make masts and oars. He also made yokes for the oxen, tables, chairs, and wooden utensils, so that there would be hardly a house in which Jesus would not be known by virtue of His work.¹

3. This then was the kind of work that Joseph did. It was not building and carving kings' palaces. It was common work for common people, in a little country place. And it was this work that our Lord learned to do, and did, till He was thirty years of age. But however plain the work might be, we may be sure it would be perfectly done. When the time came for Him to stop His work, and He came to John the Baptist to be baptized, a voice from heaven said, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.' We may be sure that the work of all those years was always what God could look on with pleasure. He could never be pleased with bad work. So our Lord, doing simple tasks, unknown by those He worked for, taught us the dignity of work, and made all honest work honourable.

We are accustomed to speak of our work as a vocation or calling. 'Let every man,' says St. Paul, 'abide in that calling wherein he was called.' Some are called to be servants, some to be masters, some to administer five talents, others one; but every man is as truly called of God to his life-work as the painter to paint, or the physician to heal. What counts in God's sight is less the actual work we do than the way in which we do it. What we make, makes us. The slight gauze on which the mantle of the incandescent light is formed flares away in a moment, but the firmer fabric wrought on it by chemical agents will be luminous for a thousand hours. So the things we make in the world pass quickly away, but the motives with which we do them go to make us for better or worse. If you do your work perfunctorily, you become a hypocrite; if you work carelessly, you become a sloven; if you work only to please men, the sense of God will die out of your life. At the close of life's working day we shall be rewarded, not according to the results we have accomplished,

¹ A. Schofield, *Where He Dwelt*, 107.

but according to the faithfulness with which we have done the work God hath given us to do.

In all He did He was an artist, not an artisan. You ask the difference? I will tell you. The artist is he who strives to perfect his work, the artisan he who seeks only to get it done. The artist would fain finish too, but with him it is to 'finish the work God has given him to do.' It is not how great a thing we do, but how well we do the thing we have to do, that puts us in the noble brotherhood of artists.²

4. And Jesus' work as a carpenter was not only good in itself, but it helped to fit Him for His public work later on. In His ministry He had to walk long distances, over bad roads, under a burning sun. He was often surrounded and followed by people who wished to hear Him, or to be healed of sickness, till He had no leisure to rest or even to eat, and after a long day of work for others He passed the night in prayer. It was His hard, simple life in His early years that made His body strong to endure all that fatigue, and that gave Him sympathy with all weary toilers. If He had been a learned Rabbi in Jerusalem He could never have understood the feelings and the needs of poor people in the same way.

The little children knew Him, and had often gone to play about His shop and never received an unkind word. Many a poor old body who had come to pick up the chips and shavings said, 'Oh yes; we know Him right well, the Carpenter.' Everything about Him made Him one with the people. His very disciples were simple fishermen who by their presence encouraged the people to draw near. He wore the dress of the people, not that of the Rabbis, and told His disciples not to put on the long robes of the Pharisees. His look and tone and manner were all simple and homely.

There is a pretty story told by Martin Luther of a good bishop who earnestly prayed that God would reveal to him something more than the Bible tells about the childhood of Jesus. At last he had a dream. He dreamed that he saw a carpenter working with saws and hammers and planes, just like any carpenter, and beside him a little boy picking up chips. Then came a sweet-faced woman in a green dress, and called them both to dinner, and set porridge before them. All this the bishop saw in his dream, himself standing behind the door, that he might not be perceived. Then the little boy, spying him, cried out, 'Why does that man stand there? Shall he not eat of our porridge with us?' Thereupon the bishop awoke. This charming little dream-fable carries with it a beautiful and an important truth. It is the

² W. A. Newman Hall, *Do Out the Duty*, 3.

carpenter's child who wanted all the world to share His porridge with Him who has conquered the heart of humanity.¹

6. The people of Nazareth were offended at being taught by a carpenter. Very likely He had worked for many of them and they knew His parents and His brothers and sisters. We might not have known better. We are apt to despise poor people and people we know, or think we know—for we really know nobody as God knows them—and we should remember that, where the people of Nazareth saw only the village carpenter, God saw His beloved Son in whom He was well pleased.

They said, 'The carpenter's son.' To me,
No dearer thing in the Book I see,
For He must have risen with the light,
And patiently toiled until the night.
He too was weary when evening came,
For well He knoweth our mortal frame,
And He remembers the weight of dust,
So His frail children may sing and trust.

We often toil till our eyes grow dim,
Yet our hearts faint not because of Him.
The workers are striving everywhere,
Some with a pitiful load of care,
Many in peril upon the sea,
Or deep in the mine's dark mystery,
While mothers nor day nor night can rest;
I fancy the Master loves them best.

For many a little head has lain,
On the heart pierced by redemption's pain.
He was so tender with fragile things,
He saw the sparrow with broken wings.
His mother, loveliest woman born,
Had humble tasks in her home each morn,
And He thought of her the cross above,
So burdened women must have His love.

For labour, the common lot of man,
Is part of a kind Creator's plan,
And he is a king whose brow is wet
With the pearl-gemmed crown of honest sweat.
Some glorious day, this understood,
All toilers will be a brotherhood.
With brain or hand the purpose is one,
And the master Workman, God's own Son.²

Chinese Sidelights upon Scripture Passages.

BY THE REV. W. ARTHUR CORNABY, WUSUEH, CHINA.

II.

THE PORTAL OF THE SCRIPTURES.—In the forefront of the Hebrew Scriptures we find a grandly

¹ H. Halsey, *The Beauty of the Lord*, 220.

² Myra Goodwin Plantz.

decisive utterance ('In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth') which serves as a great coupling text to two distinct, yet related, accounts of Creation: (a) in general and (b) of mankind—a literary form that is suggestive of the Greek letter II. And, further, in the account of Creation in general (Gn 1²⁻³¹ 2¹⁻³) we find the same literary form—three progressive statements being set over against three other progressive statements, which are alike crowned with a final statement of completion. Is it likely that this doubly occurring literary form is a mere coincidence?

Where Western nations are mostly content with a 'front door' (larger perhaps than the average) as a chief entrance to public buildings, the ancient nations gave great prominence to portals. In Greece and Rome the portico of a temple was generally its chief architectural part. And we of west Europe have unconsciously followed a venerable and wide-spread custom in the erection of our Marble Arch, Arc de Triomphe, and the like. From the Egyptian pylons to the Japanese torēs, there are unnumbered instances of the portal being, in and of itself, a highly important object in ancient architecture. In China (besides monumental arches) stone portals are erected to mark important precincts. On the river front, before a chief city gate, we often find a separate portal, inscribed with parallel mottoes on the two uprights, and a general motto on the lintel. And is it by accident that the literary form of the great opening-portion of the Scriptures so closely resembles such a portal?

Our knowledge of pre-Babylonian Chaldea, and of the Babylonian realm under Hammurabi and his successors, is singularly full as regards many of its manners and customs, but somewhat lacking as regards the specific architecture of those times. Yet, from all analogy, we may gather that portals were much in evidence there; and that those portals were often inscribed with mottoes—from the fact that Moses commanded the descendants of Abraham to write sacred mottoes 'upon the doorposts of their houses and upon their gates' (Dt 6⁹). He may possibly have had an Egyptian precedent in mind. But the genius of Hebrew motto-writing (as in the Proverbs), and poetic composition generally, follows the lines of parallelism and antithesis, as among the early Chaldeans, and the ancient and modern Chinese. And his exhortation is likely to have had a Chaldean precedent also.

From the vantage-ground of an East Asian land of ancient survivals it seems more than possible, then, that the Elohist poem of Creation was intentionally based on the model of an inscribed portal—whether by the Hebrew writer himself, or by some more ancient Chaldean writer, from whose composition it may have been revised and edited.

But whether intentionally thus written or not, this poem of Creation (Gn 1²⁻³¹ 2¹⁻³) coincides in its structure with the literary decoration of a stone portal, or gate of entrance, from of old until modern days throughout East Asia, the essentials of which are a strophe, an anti-strophe, and then a sentence to couple or crown both.

On the one side of this Scripture portal we find¹ the creation (1) of light, (2) of air and water, (3) of land, and the climax of inanimate nature. On the other side we find the creation (1) of lights, (2) of life in air and water, (3) of life on land, and the climax of animate nature. And on the lintel, the Divine repose of accomplished enterprise.

It is through this Porta Triumphalis of sublime achievement that we enter the sacred precincts of Divine workmanship upon the less tractable chaos of human passion, cheered by the hope that even this age-long enterprise will in the end be crowned with a like rest, for God and for man (cf. Is 40²⁸ 42¹⁻⁴).

THE NUMBER SEVEN.—The numerical sign of perfection in China is usually ten, as in Egypt of old.² All the more striking, then, is the fact that in that ancient book of divination, the *Classic of Changes*, which so fascinated Confucius that he longed for fifty more years in which to study it, there are passages to the effect that 'the revolution of all things is completed every seventh day.'

This primeval division of time into periods of seven days was traced in China, as in old Chaldea, to the 'seven regulators'—the Sun, Moon, and Venus, Jupiter, Mercury, Mars, Saturn (which 'five stars' are conceived as 'regulating' the 'five elements': metal, wood, water, fire, earth).

There is a weird parable of Creation given in

the works of the Taoist mystic Chuang Tzu (third and fourth century B.C.):

'The *Yang* lord (of brightness or radiation), he of the southern seas, and the *Yin* lord (of obscurity or receptivity) of the northern seas often met in the realms of the lord of the centre, whose name was Chaos. He always treated them well, and so they consulted together to find some means of recompense, saying: "Every man has two organs of sight, and two of hearing, one of taste and one of smell. Chaos alone has none of these. Let us try and pierce some for him." Accordingly the first day they succeeded in piercing the first aperture' (*i.e.* giving him *light*), 'but by the time that *seven days* had elapsed, Chaos died.'

METAPHOR AND MYTH.—Over against the Hebrew metaphor בָּרָא, 'to brood' (Gn 1²), we have the Chinese conception of a primordial egg, pictorially represented as divided in its substance by a curved line, on one side of which it is black, and on the other white, from the incipient Yin and Yang principles.

All ancient writing was once pictorial. And while the Hebrew word בָּרָא, 'to create,' seems to have the root idea of cutting or carving out, the corresponding Chinese word *t'sang* (or *ch'uang*) contains the 'knife radical' and has the same root meaning. This might hardly be worth a passing reference but for the fact that, in China, the verbal metaphor anciently grew into a full-fledged myth of one P'an Ku, an impossible stone mason who, being evolved in the midst of a highly solidified chaos, set to work with his hammer and chisel hewing out heaven and earth (as recorded, if somewhat apologetically, in Chinese history). His breath became the wind, his voice the thunder, his left eye the sun, his right eye the moon, his blood the rivers, his hair the trees and herbs, his flesh the soil, his sweat the rain, and the parasites which infested his body the human race! A crude instance this, of the misuse of metaphor, which, in a more refined form, has not been entirely absent from some of the great scriptural or doctrinal controversies of Christendom.

LITERARY PARALLELISM.—The first of the ancient Odes, or folk songs of China (dating from about Solomon's time, and edited by Confucius in

¹ The parallelism in the Elohist account of Creation was pointed out by Professor Elmslie in the *Contemporary Review*, December 1887.

² Hence, while the Israelites were yet under Egyptian influence we read of ten plagues, Ten Commandments, and, as late as the days of Eli, 'ten sons' (1 Sam 1⁸).

the fifth century B.C.), exemplifies the literary parallelism which marks the average Hebrew poetical composition, and indeed much resembles a passage in the Canticles :

Waking and sleeping he sought her,
Sought her but found her not ;
Waking and sleeping he cherished her,
Long, long he thought upon her,
Turning from side to side.

The Chinese, with their monosyllabic words, and mosaic-like character blocks, have developed their scheme of literary parallelism to an extreme of refinement. In one of the best poems of China, by the painter-poet Wang Wei (d. 750 A.D.), the five-word lines translate almost literally thus :

Declining day-beams light each rustic home,
Along the lanes the flocks returning come ;
The aged men their herdsman sons await,
And staff-supported stand beside the gate ;

The wild birds fly o'er fields of ripening corn,
The silkworms sleep on mulberry twigs half-shorn ;
With shouldered hoe the farmers homeward stride,
To spend in social chat the eventide.

The general scheme of parallelism in the whole will be noted, but in the original of lines five and six there is also a complete parallelism of character to character, as well as the real antithesis of wild wings in motion and of worms in repose, and the further apparent antithesis of fulness and scarcity (crops and tree-twigs), with the actual blending of felicitous thought. This is fine art, such as is prized in mottoes for doorways and guest-rooms. And not a few Hebrew couplets are found to have a basis of very exact parallelism. Thus Ps 126^{5, 6} might be read in terser form, as though in Chinese :

Going forth, sorrowing, scattering good seed ;
Coming home, rejoicing, gathering much grain.

Fulfilment of the Law.

BY THE REV. W. T. WHITLEY, M.A., LL.D., PRESTON.

OUR Lord announced that He did not come to destroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil. What exactly did He mean?

To 'fulfil the prophets' is a phrase used extensively by Matthew, who evidently meant, To match prediction by accomplishment. The other half of the phrase might by analogy be understood, To match an order by obedience. But it has received much less attention, and lately it has been quoted in very illegitimate connections, with untenable senses put on it, to support positions open to grave challenge. Because of the practical proposals made, it seems desirable to examine the Biblical basis of these proposals, and to inquire rigorously into the meaning of the phrase, To fulfil the Law.

The Law in question is the Jewish Law, and nothing else. Our Lord's horizon in most of His prophetic ministry was national, and Matthew emphasizes this aspect of it. The Sermon on the Mount was spoken to Jews, and they attached very definite meanings to the terms "Law" and "Prophets."

The inquiry therefore is as to the verb Fulfil, which is used ninety times in the N.T., while a noun derived from it, generally translated Fulness,

occurs seventeen times. We may compare these passages and derive from them the various meanings of the Greek verb, then test which meaning best suits the present passage. The result may be checked by a wider induction from the N.T. as to the actual relation of our Lord to the Law, and by another inquiry as to the present status of the Law.

I. THE USAGE OF THE WORD FULFIL.

To Fulfil is literally to Fill full ; as a valley is levelled up with earth and stones from a mountain, for a highway ; as a net is filled with fish, or a measure with corn ; as a hole in a coat is filled with a patch, or baskets are filled with fragments of bread and fish. By a slight extension from material things, as a house is pervaded with the presence of the Spirit, or Jerusalem with teaching about the Lord.

The literal meaning is rare, and it is the derived meanings that need to be examined. We may pass instances of the active voice, men being filled with joy, sorrow, knowledge, comfort, unrighteousness ; and may study passages speaking of some object being fulfilled. These fall into three groups, which are typically Lucan, Johannine, Pauline.

Luke habitually uses the word with the general sense, Complete and End. Four times he speaks of times being ended, Lk 21²⁴, Ac 7²³⁻³⁰ 9²³; once of sayings, Lk 7¹; once of events, Ac 19²¹; four times of a piece of service, Lk 9³¹, Ac 12²⁵ 13²⁵ 14²⁶. The same sense is found also at Mk 1¹⁵, Jn 7⁸. The corresponding noun, never used by Luke, signifies a Completed number, Ro 11¹²⁻²⁵, a Completed time or times, Gal 4⁴, Eph 1¹⁰.

In the Fourth Gospel we find the phrase, 'Joy is fulfilled' (3²⁹ 15¹¹ 16²⁴ 17¹³); and the same idea is in Ph 2² 4¹⁹, 2 Th 1¹¹, though in two of these cases the verb is active. The sense here is to Complete and Satisfy. The derived noun has a kindred meaning of Satisfying Completeness in Jn 1¹⁶, Col 1¹⁹ 2⁹, Eph 1²³ 3¹⁹ 4¹³, Ro 15²⁹.

The way Paul generally uses the verb is closely akin to this, to Complete and Satisfy, to Complete and Discharge a duty. At Ro 15¹⁹ he says he has discharged his duty of preaching throughout a district; at Col 4¹⁷ he bids Archippus discharge his duty; at Col 1²⁵ he declares his commission to be the complete carrying out of God's word. Thrice he deals with the very idea before us, Fulfilling the Law; at Gal 5¹⁵ the meaning is that the whole Law is completely carried out in one maxim; at Ro 8⁴, the requirement of the Law may be completely discharged in us; at Ro 13⁸, he that loves his neighbour has completely obeyed the Law. And the noun expresses the same thought, Ro 13¹⁰, Love is the satisfaction of the Law.

Outside the first Gospel we thus find simply two shades of meaning: Complete and End, Complete and Satisfy. We have now to test which is more suitable here.

The verb occurs in Matthew seventeen times, twice meaning literally, Fill. Thirteen instances refer to the accomplishment of predictions, more akin to the second shade. There remain two cases, Fulfil all righteousness, Fulfil the Law; and presumably in kindred phrases the meaning is the same. Our Lord certainly did not mean that He was bringing righteousness to an end, we therefore take the second meaning. He told John that He had come to satisfy the requirements of righteousness; He told the people that He had come to satisfy the Law.

Thus we are guided to the sense, Respect, Discharge, Obey completely. This is arrived at by strict induction from every passage in the N.T. where the verb and its derived noun occur.

In the LXX the same meaning is found at Ps 20⁴⁻⁵.

It is surprising to find this meaning summarily rejected by Hort (*Jud. Christianity*, 15): 'We may safely neglect the meaning which perhaps comes first to mind, that of personal obedience or performance, as we speak of the fulfilment of an injunction.' No reason is vouchsafed for this curt dismissal, and the next sentence is more astonishing: 'Its true meaning answers much more exactly to that destroying or undoing to which it is here formally opposed.' That is to say, our Lord was drawing a distinction without a difference! and was explaining away a fear that was well founded! Presently the text is thus interpreted (page 18): The Law 'remained binding within its own limits, but it was to be filled out and deepened by a new spirit, the prohibition of murder, for instance, being fulfilled by the prohibition of anger against a brother.' To this explanation, which carries with it a train of implications from which we dissent, we oppose the simple fact that the word Fulfil never bears any such meaning elsewhere.

The meaning at which we have arrived is fully accepted by Archdeacon Allen in his commentary; to Reaffirm and Carry out in detail. It agrees with the other part of the sentence, which will then mean: I am come to match the orders of the Law and the predictions of the Prophets by punctilious performance. But Mr. Allen also notes, what is often overlooked, that these verses do not explain the discussion of the Law which follows. Perhaps Hort's refusal to accept what he owned to be the obvious meaning, was due to the tacit idea that v.¹⁷ is a text, vv.²¹⁻⁴⁸ are illustrations of the text. Another connexion avoids the difficulty, and shows a progress of thought, as to the Law, and as to the authority of Christ. 'I am not here to repeal the Law as lawgiver, nor to defy it as rebel, but to obey it as under law. Till I have obeyed it, it stands in all respects. As lawgiver, I raise for the future a higher standard of conduct; the Law is inadequate in some respects, and absolutely bad in others. My comprehensive maxim is, Do as you would be done by. This contains everything good in the Law and in the teaching of the Prophets. To appreciate it is easy, to perform it is needful; for I am more than obedient to the Law, I am the lawgiver.'

Such a movement of thought is coherent in itself, and is congruous with other teaching. It removes

all temptation to read back into the word Fulfil various shades of meaning suggested by the drastic criticisms of the Law in the rest of the chapter. It leaves us free to adhere to the meaning which 'comes first to mind,' and which contents such lexicographers as Cremer and Thayer. But it raises theological questions which are too often evaded by understanding the word otherwise. And to these we must advance.

2. OUR LORD'S OBEDIENCE TO THE LAW.

The conclusion from usage may now be confirmed from an examination of what our Lord actually did in relation to the Law. He obeyed it in every respect, and was careful to impress upon others their habitual disobedience and His obedience.

He told the lepers whom He healed, what the Law required of them. He appealed to it in argument repeatedly, even while asserting that no one really kept it (Jn 7¹⁹). More than once He invited any accusation that He was breaking it, and when murmurs were heard as to His disregard of the Sabbath, He defended Himself not by repudiating the Sabbath-law, but by quoting precedents and arguing that He was still keeping it, in spirit and in letter. On one dramatic occasion, when the death-penalty prescribed in the Law was not consonant with public feeling, and the scribes tried to entrap Him into contradicting it, He overcame the difficulty by inducing them to waive their accusation. He defended another precept as to sexual morality, and even showed that He was prepared to go further. And when the fictions of the lawyers had contrived an evasion of another precept, He plainly accused them of rejecting the commandment of God. Such incidents illustrate how they were destroying the Law, He was upholding it.

On His last evening with the disciples, He reflected that He had accomplished what He was entrusted with; this of course surveys much more, but it includes contentment with having kept the Law. Next morning one charge against Him was that by their Law He ought to die. If indeed He had 'made Himself' the Son of God, He would not have denied the application of the Law. But His closing breath reiterated the claim of the supper room, and announced that it was finished. Again, whatever more was finished, His life of obedience to the Law was over. Born under the

Law, He had redeemed those who were under the Law. All things were accomplished; the Law had not been destroyed by Him, it had been completely carried out and satisfied.

Thus the events in our Lord's life confirm our interpretation of His utterance: He said that He would obey the Law; He did. But another question soon forced itself on the attention of His followers, who had heard such an utterance as 'The Law and the Prophets until John.' What was the binding force of the Law after His obedience? All was accomplished; did it hold any longer in any jot or tittle?

3. OUR LORD'S ENDING OF THE LAW.

We have seen that the word Fulfil has as one shade of meaning, To Complete and Finish; does that shade also attach to our Lord's utterance? When He obeyed it, did He thereby exhaust it? Our English laws as to contracts easily suggest as much. A contract may be found very onerous, and a man may be tempted to repudiate it or to declare himself bankrupt rather than fulfil his side; but if he does honourably fulfil it, and the other party fulfils his side, then the contract has no further binding force: being fulfilled, it cannot be enforced again. The question is of real and present importance; is the Law still binding on a Jew?

In the Acts and the Epistles we can see this question being raised, and successive answers being given. The earliest converts from the Jews still frequented the temple, but the drift of the new teaching was such that Stephen was charged with speaking against the Law, and with asserting that Jesus would change the customs of Moses. We can trace the exact process when Peter was convinced that he was to do something that he and his hearers knew was against the Law, when he was called to account, when he vindicated his action (Ac 10²⁹ 11^{2, 17, 18}). He was presently persuaded that this was no isolated case, but a precedent (Gal 2¹¹⁻¹⁴). The next step was taken when an attempt was made to impose the Law upon Gentile converts, and the attempt was decisively defeated (Ac 15). The debate shows that few had grasped as yet that the Law was obsolete even for Jews, but it shows Peter taking up a position more advanced than before, declaring it an unbearable yoke.

Opinion ripened when troubles arose in other

Gentile churches; Paul argued out what he had summarily announced (Ac 13³⁹), that no one could achieve salvation by keeping the Law. As he unfolded his argument to the Romans, he arrived at the conclusion, not only that the Law was useless as a means of salvation, but that Christians are dead to the Law, discharged from it (Ro 7^{4, 6}). He was careful to say that the Law was good; he went as far as to say that he was establishing it rather than voiding it; but the course of the argument shows that he was establishing it on a very new footing. Its value henceforth consisted, as it had been with the Psalmist, in convincing a man of his sin and impotence (Ro 7^{7, 21}); and in driving him in despair to Christ for salvation (Ro 7²⁴⁻²⁵, Gal 3²⁴). As a means of salvation it is ineffective, as a Law it is not binding on a Christian (Ro 8^{3, 2}). Christ is the end of the Law (Ro 10⁴); He is the climax to whom it was leading up; He brings it to an end.

Paul developed this doctrine at much length, and in his later writings it appears incidentally, as axiomatic. What divided Jew from Gentile? the Law: Christ's work was to reconcile Jew and Gentile, therefore He broke down the wall, abolishing the Law (Eph 2¹⁵). The bond written in ordinances, He has taken out of the way and nailed it to the cross (Col 2¹⁴). The Law was made for sinners, and is good for them; but it is not meant for a man justified by Christ (1 Ti 1^{8, 9}).

Cognate doctrine was taught in other quarters. James contented himself with the negative side and did not explicitly unfold the positive. When he expounded what is pure religion, he did not mention the Law; rather he referred to the perfect law of liberty, the royal law: and this, though he expressed it in a sentence from the Law, is not that Mosaic Law. Concerning that, he said briefly that a breach of it in any one point is as bad as a general disregard—whence it follows that it may as well be neglected altogether. He reassured that the law by which we shall be judged, is a law of liberty (2⁸⁻¹²). Yet he forbade to speak evil of the Law (4¹¹); the point is that while it is good, it is no longer put forward as binding. Meanwhile, as regards Gentiles, James had taken the lead in dictating the letter which expressly exonerated them from any obligation to it.

Many Hebrews were reluctant to abandon their venerable code, and it became necessary to re-

iterate that the Law was expired. Paul had dropped the hint that it was only parenthetical, till Christ (Gal 3^{17, 19}). This was now developed on a new side, illustrations being taken from the ritual side rather than the ethical. The argument ran substantially thus: The Law confined the priesthood to the sons of Aaron, yet a psalmist contemplated another priesthood on the lines of Melchizedek; this involved a change of the Law (He 7¹²). The priesthood made nothing perfect; this fact revealed that the Law made nothing perfect, that it was weak and unprofitable; the Psalmist foresaw a time when it would be annulled, indeed, the oath he records virtually annulled it at once; (7^{18, 19, 28}). Jeremiah saw that the first Covenant, which was the foundation of the whole Law, was faulty, and he predicted a new one; that prediction deprived the Law of its title to respect, showing it to be obsolescent (8). As for the details of ritual in the Law, meats and drinks and ablutions, with the gifts and sacrifices, they were mere temporary ordinances, quite useless to satisfy the conscience (9^{9, 10}). Ceaseless shedding of blood, and occasional sprinkling of ashes, might suit a material tabernacle; but such things were only shadows of realities, and needed to be reiterated because they effected nothing except keeping the conscience in a turmoil at their obvious insufficiency. Another voice repudiated the whole system, and offered in its place the doing of God's will. This is the essence of Christ's work, taking away the mere Law of Moses, to establish Inward Obedience (10^{1-18, 28}). To shrink back from this to the shelter of the Law, is to displease God, as the prophet saw; it is really to court perdition (10^{38, 39}).

This pronouncement was unmistakable. Henceforth no one could fancy that any Christian was bound to keep the Law; ethically it was behind the times, ritually it was external and slightly absurd.

In the writings of John, the Law is mentioned by him just once, as a foil: 'What did Moses give? The Law! What did Jesus Christ bring? Grace and truth.' His Epistles ignore it entirely, and emphasize as the all-sufficient rule of conduct the one sentence singled out by the Lord, which had won previous endorsement: 'Love one another.'

This review of apostolic teaching as to the Law illustrates the meaning attached here to our Lord's words. He came to 'fulfil' it. Fulfilling is not expanding it into a thing of beauty, bringing it to

fulness and completion, so as to inaugurate a new era of usefulness for it. No apostle takes that view of it. Fulfilling is, primarily, obeying it, and secondarily, bringing it to an end. Its chief value had been to educate a longing for a Saviour, while incidentally it had reflected something of Christ before His coming, as the Alpine peak catches the rays before the sun shines into the valleys. Now that the Saviour is come, and we dwell in the light of the sun of righteousness, what need of any childish toying with a mirror?

4. TWO APPLICATIONS OF THE DOCTRINE.

The early Church grasped this fully. While appeal was made to the O.T. in many ways, so that this assumed a position for all Christians quite unlike any other literature, there was deliberate and repeated repudiation of the Law as binding. Ignatius warned two churches against Judaizing; Justin discussed the matter with Trypho at some length; Aristides and others were at pains to dissociate Christians from Jews in the eyes of the world at large. But as the Jewish Christians were outnumbered by Gentile, were isolated and forgotten, other currents began to run. The positions of 'Barnabas' and Marcion provoked a reaction, the antithesis was no longer so clear, and within three centuries a new legalism arose. It is needless to mention all the errors which from time to time have been buttressed by false ideas as to the Law; but there are two modern misconceptions which deserve to be pointed out, that it may be seen how untenable they are when the words of our Lord are rightly understood.

One is as to conduct. Modern Jews have classified their Law into various sections: Sacrificial, Ceremonial, Political, Moral. The Sacrificial and Political precepts they hold to be in abeyance because they have no temple and no national existence; the Ceremonial and the Moral they consider still obligatory. With much less logic, some Christians cast away also the Ceremonial, but look fondly on the Moral, and they especially revere the Ten Commandments.

To this course there are many objections. Those commandments are plainly prefaced: 'I Jehovah am thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt.' Jehovah did not bring us Britons out of Egypt; and this preface warns us that the commandments were for another people, as much as the Code of Hammurabi or of Confucius.

Again, those commandments are part, and only part, of a far more extensive code, whose first instalment covers Ex 20-23. We have no right to take part and neglect the rest of this code; in its final form as known in our Lord's day and to us, it emphatically presents itself as one complete whole. Repeatedly we are warned against picking out portions; if we touch any, we are debtors to keep the whole Law. Still less are we at liberty to modify; the only consistent Christians here are the Seventh-day Baptists, who take the Fourth Commandment quite simply and obey it literally. Again, those commandments are seriously inadequate, and were exposed as such by our Lord. They forbid murder but not anger, adultery but not lascivious words, false evidence but not lying. In the light of His teaching we see that they are mainly negative; they offer no hint as to courtesy, humility, mercy, which are set in the forefront by Him. As a code of conduct, the Law is defective, redundant, misleading; it is far inferior to the one rule, 'Love one another.'

There is another and newer misconception. Dr. Farquhar has recently studied the relationship of Christianity to Hinduism (*J.R.M.*, July 1914), and he quotes this saying of our Lord as the key to the situation. But when he speaks of the conception of Fulfilment, he interprets it differently. 'In most cases He fulfils by universalizing a narrow precept, or moralizing an external command.' It has already been pointed out that He is not fulfilling in the cases cited (Mt 5²¹⁻⁴⁴), He is criticizing adversely. Much more to the point is the recognition that 'there is another group of cases in which, while the moralizing process is very prominent, there is also the dissolution of an old institution. . . . In all these cases the change is so overturning that the idea of completion scarcely seems to fit well.' It certainly does not, and we have shown that this is a different thought. Unfortunately Dr. Farquhar reads back this thought into the word Fulfil, and then, with the wrong idea that Christ made the Law blossom out into Christianity, he draws his inferences.

He turns to India, and argues that Christ can make Hinduism also blossom out into Christianity. In this reasoning there are two fallacies. Our Lord was speaking of the Jewish Law, not of Hinduism at all: what He could do for the one, He never promised for the other; the one was God's careful preparation in one chosen nation until the fulness

of time came, and there is nothing beyond a general statement that God has not left Himself without witness in any nation, to encourage the thought that a similar preparation has been made in other great religious systems. The second fallacy is that with which this paper is concerned. He did not say of the Law that He came to make it bloom out

into perfection, but that He came to obey it. Whether or no He meant that He came to end it, He really did so, and the apostles taught that explicitly.

Dr. Farquhar's practical proposals have no scriptural support here, and his projects show the dangers that arise when we forget the elementary process of examining what a word means.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REV. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., D.LITT., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

*The Hittites.*¹

THE Hittites have fallen into good hands. They have now found a historian in the most distinguished historical scholar of Germany, Professor Eduard Meyer, who has just published an account of them and their monuments, which is at once clear, compact, and thorough. It falls into two parts, the first of these being intended for the general public, while the second part contains an exhaustive list of references together with a mass of scientific details, all brought up to date. There are numerous illustrations, moreover, which have been selected with remarkable skill.

That the work should have been entrusted to Professor Eduard Meyer is peculiarly appropriate. It was an article of his that first drew my attention to the Hittite monuments years ago, and it was he who first welcomed and accepted my discovery of the Hittite empire. To those who remember the controversies of the early eighties, the universal acceptance to-day of the views which I then propounded will seem somewhat astonishing.

But before going further I have to make a confession. While the learned world has come over to my historical theories and combinations, I have myself been forced by the decipherment of the inscriptions to modify them in one important point. Professor Meyer's book represents my historical belief up to two or three years ago; I have now been compelled to change it. Instead of one Hittite empire, with its capital at Boghaz-Keui, north of the Halys, there were two empires, the second of which rose on the ruins of the first. This second empire was the

Cilician empire of Solinus, which was founded by the Moschians—not by the Hittites proper—about B.C. 1200, and had its main centre at Tyana. It is to this second empire that the hieroglyphic inscriptions belong which testify to its spread from Lydia in the west to Carchemish in the east, and in which Sandes or Sandakos appears as the national god in place of Tesub. Most of the monuments, accordingly, which we have regarded as evidence of the existence of the earlier empire really bear witness, not to the Hittites of Boghaz-Keui, but to the Moschian Hittites of Tyana. Indeed, it is probable that the same Moschians formed part of the host of northern barbarians, as the Egyptians called them, who destroyed the earlier Hittite empire and swept over the civilized world as far as the borders of Egypt. Chushan-rish-athaim of Naharaim would have been one of their kings.

I can, therefore, no longer regard many of the monuments figured in Professor Meyer's book, as well as in other works on the Hittites, including my own, as connected with the empire whose history is now being recovered from the cuneiform tablets of Boghaz-Keui. It is true that the Moschians belonged to the same racial stock as the Hittites of Boghaz-Keui, and the name Hittite occasionally appears in their inscriptions, but their language was not the same as that of Boghaz-Keui and they called themselves Moschians and Cilicians rather than Hittites. Nor were they governed by an autocratic monarchy like the Hittites of the first empire; their government was theocratic, and the numerous kinglets were under the control of a high priest. The Hittite hieroglyphics, however, were used at Boghaz-Keui contemporaneously with the cuneiform characters, but whether the

¹ *Reich und Kultur der Chetiter.* By Eduard Meyer. Berlin, 1914.

phonetic values attached to them were the same as those which they had in the later texts is questionable.

It must be borne in mind, therefore, that in Professor Meyer's book, as in all previous works upon the Hittites, two entirely different periods of 'Hittite' history have been combined together, which it will be the business of future research to separate and disentangle. We shall probably discover that what is true of the one is not necessarily true of the other.

It is needless to say that the whole body of material at present known to us has been treated by Professor Meyer with masterly skill. Lucid arrangement, historical insight, and sound judgment are well-known characteristics of the author, and his book, as might be expected, is not a compilation merely, but contains new facts and fresh points of view. Some of the illustrations appear in it for the first time.

The seal with cuneiform characters given on page 44 seems to be an attempt to represent a real inscription and not an example of the use of cuneiform characters for ornamental purposes only. The inner circle of characters would read *us-ti(?) -ku(?) -wa-as*, while the outer circle is *si-i-e(?) -khu-uz-zi-ya us-te- . . . -ka(?) -ar*. The statement that men and deities are not represented with a beard on the monuments of Carchemish must be corrected in the light of the recent excavations there. The identification, moreover, of Katpatuka with Kizzuwadana (as the name is written in the cuneiform tablets of Boghaz-Keui) is not due to Dr. Herzfeld, as Professor Meyer believes, but to Professor Hommel, who suggested it several years ago. In Hittite history Cappadocia took the place of Arzawa—which, by the way, is mentioned in the

Golénischeff Geographical Papyrus—just as Quê took the place of Alashiya in Eastern Cilicia during the Moschian age. But these are minute details, interesting only to the "Hittitologist"!

The first part of the report on the excavations at Carchemish conducted by the British Museum has just been issued in a princely volume entitled *Carchemish* (British Museum, 1914). It contains a short Preface by Sir F. C. Kenyon, and an exhaustive and very instructive introduction by Mr. Hogarth on Djerabis or Jerablus, the modern site of Carchemish. This is followed by a series of plates with photographs of the inscriptions and sculptures discovered by the excavators, Messrs. Woolley and Lawrence. The plates leave nothing to be desired, and the completeness and artistic finish of the inscriptions make them the most valuable Hittite hieroglyphic texts that have yet been found. They materially lighten the task of the decipherer, whose thanks are due to the authorities of the British Museum for their early publication.

Some of the oldest texts belong to Katuas, who may be the Katê of the Assyrian inscriptions, who was king of Quê in B.C. 850. One of the chapels was built by Kanas, high priest of Quê, to whom the long inscription now in the British Museum also belongs. The finest of the inscriptions, however, is that of Imeis (or Yamois), who was viceroy of the great king of Tyana.

The sculptures throw a welcome light on later Hittite art. The archaeological results of the excavations, however, are not touched upon in the present volume; for these we must go to the articles contributed to the *Times* and other papers by Messrs. Hogarth and Woolley.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ST. LUKE.

LUKE XVII. 32.

Remember Lot's Wife.

1. Lot's wife appears but a moment on the page of history. She is like a spectre, rising from the earth, moving slowly across our field of vision, and then disappearing. Hence her history is all

centred in a single point, and that the last. It has no beginning and no middle, but an end—a fearful end. Its course is like that of the black and silent train, to which the match is at last applied, and it ends in a flash and an explosion. Our first view of Lot's wife is afforded by the light of the sulphurous flames already bursting from the battlements

and housetops of the reprobate city; our last view, the moment after, by the same fires as they mount to heaven and light up the whole horizon, revealing, among many old, familiar objects, one never seen before—a pillar of salt upon the road to Zoar. That very pillar was the thing which the disciples called to mind when Jesus said, 'Remember Lot's wife.'

2. Our Lord is speaking of His advent to judge the world, whether that advent takes place when a great city, a great empire, a great economy, passes away in blood and fire and smoke, or in those crowded moments of our individual lives in which we have to make an instant and pregnant decision between the warring affections and desires of the soul that will give a bias to our whole after life. At such moments Christ 'comes' to us, comes to force us to decision, to compel us to choose between the higher and the lower aims of human life, and to show what manner of spirit we are of. He descends—so the context implies—with all His train, and flashes by us with lightning speed. If we so love Him, and all that He stands for and represents to us, that at once, without any hesitation or delay, we choose the better part and join His train, we not only escape condemnation; we save, we quicken, our life into life eternal. But if, as in the days of Noah, and again in the days of Lot, we are so busy eating and drinking, buying and selling, planting and building, marrying and giving in marriage, so preoccupied with the cravings and affairs of this present world, or so drowned in self-indulgence and sensuous desires, that 'the things of the spirit' have little charm and value for us, and we let the critical, auspicious moment pass; if, as the heavenly pageant flashes by, we do not lift up our heads and cry, 'Thine are we, O Christ, and on Thy side, Thou Son of Man,' we miss our happy chance, and lose our life instead of saving it.

Worldliness and carnal-mindedness are incompatible with vivid realization of the presence, grace, and loving-kindness of Christ whether directly manifested or more indirectly. It is strange and fearful how the worldly and carnal spirit at once darkens the vision and deadens the spiritual senses, and by degrees reveals its inmost essence as 'enmity to God.' 'The carnal mind is enmity to God'—nothing truer! And it is terrible how hard it is to overcome the world and the flesh, especially when aided by the devil. It is like walking up a hill when there is a thaw after frost—one toils and toils, and yet keeps slipping back almost as far as one advances.¹

¹ D. W. Simon in *Life*, by F. J. Powicke, 314.

THE SPELL OF SODOM.

1. We read that Lot 'pitched his tent toward Sodom.' There is quite a dramatic touch there. Not in the city, or even near to it, but in the direction of it. He was not prepared to throw in his lot with the men of that city yet. A man cannot go direct from the company of saintly Abraham to a bacchanalian crew like that which held its revels there. He slides down to them by an easy, gradual descent. A man clings hard to the remnant of his religion, even when he has allowed the greater part of it to go. He fights for the shell and form of it more than he did for the life and substance. Lot pitched his tent toward Sodom, no doubt making virtuous resolutions that he would never go down to live there. He would only trade with these people, and visit them occasionally, and still hold himself in the main aloof. Alas for these resolutions of men whose hearts are on the down grade! Lot did not long remain in the remote outskirts of the city. The huge whirlpool swiftly drew him in. Presently we find him living at the very gates at Sodom—marvellously advanced in position, a man of great consequence, with his daughters married to notable citizens, and sunk down to the level of those citizens, so depraved that their after-story is not fit for decent lips; and his whole household has breathed the pestilent moral air of the place, and become diseased. A miserable outcome, surely, of a life that began in a noble journey of faith. With all his getting and gains and advancements he has but a poor show to make of it in the end.

2. Perhaps Lot's wife was a native of Sodom. In the earlier chapters of Abraham's story, Lot is constantly mentioned, and 'his goods,' but there is never any mention of a wife. In the recital of Lot's rescue after the Battle of the Five Kings, it is said that Abraham 'brought again his brother Lot, and his goods, and the women also, and the people.' The phraseology is too vague to make one sure that even here a wife of Lot is included, though it seems probable. May we not infer from her late appearance, that she was a daughter of the land, a native of the city 'toward' which Lot pitched his tent (Gn 13¹²)?

She followed 'behind him.' 'That is no true sacrifice,' it has been said, 'which is regretted.' Therefore Lot's wife never left Sodom. Her feet

took her out of the city; but she was of it all the time. If Calais was written on the heart of an English queen, Sodom was written on hers. Her husband, once started, would quicken his step perhaps: but his lingering had helped to make her steps leaden.

The tone of the narrative justifies us in concluding that, although Lot's own spirituality was ebbing away, Lot's wife sadly lagged behind her husband spiritually; he was tempted more and more to take her pace, his foot having already halted when he began to grow unfaithful to the gleam of God. This is the world's recurring tragedy—when a good man fails, because of some fault in his goodness, to redeem a dull-souled wife; or a good woman, like Abigail, to redeem her dull-souled husband. In Lot's household there is little trace of his piety: there are traces enough of a sinister influence in the callousness of his sons-in-law's families; to them 'he seemed as one that mocked.'

3. It may be that Lot's wife helped him to go down the steep descent; that she held him back—by sheer weight of indifference, or worse—from reclimbing the steep ascent. He would be free, with one firm stroke; but the chain of circumstance and of habit was too cunningly welded by the length of years, too insinuatingly a part of his very life. The newly awakened decision was goaded and yet weakened by the newly awakened anxiety:

I, in mine own love's strength seem to decay,
O'ercharged with burthen of mine own love's might.

Given such a companionship, of a disfigured spiritual nature allied with an earthen nature never loftily moved, the moment of the former's awakening must always be as a breath of hell, because of the sense of the ineffectiveness of all struggle. The awakened soul appeals, but the other does not respond—has no response to give. It is as if a lark, suddenly feeling the joy of wings, would have the clod where its nest and nursing-place had been rise with it to sunny altitudes of the morning. The clod is clod still, though for weeks it has felt the warmth of so tuneful a breast. Lot grew disturbed, felt the power of earlier, finer feelings, became anxious not only for himself but for others: but how could the wife at his side, with no such early raptures to aid her, rise to his sudden earnestness? It is something to the credit of his influence, perhaps, that she was willing to leave Sodom

at all. But even to the last his helpfulness was imperfect. 'He lingered.' There were links of the chain not yet snapped. She must have noticed it; and it helped to quench the 'smoking flax' of her faith—or her fear.

We are to will our salvation in such sort as God wills it; now He wills it by way of desire, and we also must incessantly desire it, in conformity with His desire. Nor does He will it only, but, in effect, gives us all necessary means to attain to it. We then, in fulfilment of the desire we have to be saved, must not only wish to be saved, but, in effect, must accept all the graces which He has provided for us, and offers us. With regard to salvation itself, it is enough to say: I desire to be saved. But, with regard to the means of salvation, it is not enough to say: I desire them. We must, with an absolute resolution, will and embrace the graces which God presents to us; for our will must correspond with God's will. And, inasmuch as He gives us the means of salvation, we ought to avail ourselves of such means, just as we ought to desire salvation in such sort as God desires it for us, and because He desires it.¹

II.

THE PULL OF THE HIGHER LIFE.

1. Lot's wife, like the rest, heard the summons to escape from Sodom. God saves all He can. The door of mercy is opened to others as well as to Lot. His wife's deliverance had been cared for too, and measures taken to secure her with the rest. One of the angels clasped her hand and drew her out of the conflagration by main force. Almost against her will she was hurried so far out of danger, and the mountain-road, with its hastening fugitives, stretched out clear before her, when, in that one glance behind, her incurably corrupt nature came out, and the stroke fell.

2. The angels took them by the hand. Here is Divine importunity. The angels use gentle constraint towards Lot and his household. The narrative not only shows that the God of righteous judgment is also a God of mercy, but it emphasizes the great truth that the Divine mercy is intense and active, pressing itself even upon those who are reluctant to receive its benefits. God is more eager to deliver than to condemn all who can be brought within the range of His compassions. The Lord's messengers would not have saved Lot and his family out of Sodom unless in their urgency they had taken the group of hesitating worldlings by the hand and overborne their double-mindedness. The utmost

¹ St. Francis De Sales, *The Love of God*, viii. 4.

wisdom and persuasion bade fair to prove un-availing without this added mark of zeal. And if angels could do their work only at a white heat of fervour we shall not attain success in attempts made at any lower temperature.

I have known young men saved by the voice of a kindly bystander who, seeing the struggle in their face, has said, 'I would not do it, if I were you, sir,' or by a sudden recollection of a pure and loving home, and of the grief and shame with which it would be darkened were it ever known that they had yielded to a temptation so base. And how could they help being saved if they remembered that the kindest Heart in the universe would be pained by their fall?—if they could hear the tender voice of the Son of Man, saying, 'Son, remember.'¹

Complain not that the way is long—what road is weary that leads there?

But let the Angel take thy hand, and lead thee up the misty stair,

And then with beating heart await the opening of the Golden Gate.²

III.

FATAL HESITATION.

1. Lot's wife lingered on her way, and hastened not to escape for her life; she tempted God by her disobedience, and that disobedience, that forbidden delay, was her ruin. She was turned into a pillar of salt, which is supposed to mean that she was caught by the burning flames, which had by this time extended far across the plain; she was caught by them and encrusted, as it were, by the particles of sulphur which they contained; and so, instead of crumbling to ashes, she remained after death a standing monument of the Almighty's wrath, which is revealed from heaven against all the children of disobedience.

It is one act, one look only, and one lingering step, that has thus passed irrevocably into the rock for ever associated with the name of Lot's wife; but just as, with the saint or martyr in one great and good act of faith, there is much going before, preparing for that trial of a moment, so must it have been with her. How much may be contained in one hesitating step, and one sigh of regret! An act, a word, a look—even a thought or resolution which has had no opportunity of showing itself in act, word, or glance—has decided for ever the lot of the human soul. Was it not by one short transgression of Eve that all was lost? But why is it thus? Because, though such may

stand singly in the life of any one as it comes out to man, yet in the secret history of the soul, as seen by the eye of God; such cannot stand alone; much must have been going on before the will has taken its decided bent for good or evil.

2. 'She looked back.' The words used in Genesis when we are told that she 'looked back' on the burning city is a much stronger word than that used two verses lower down, where we are told that Abraham 'looked toward Sodom and Gomorrah.' Abraham's look was only a rapid and terrified glance; but the look of Lot's wife was a look 'of deliberate contemplation, of steadfast regard, of strong desire.' She looked back wistfully, longingly, as one whose treasure was in the city, and whose heart was there also. She would fain have gone after her heart had she dared. She would rather have stayed amid all the sins of Sodom, if she might have carried on her old easy life in it, than have climbed the mountain, to commence a new life and to dwell apart with God. Her look was an unspoken prayer; and her prayer was answered: she knew 'the misery of a granted prayer.' She lingered behind as one who would fain stay behind; and she did stay, though only as a heap of salt, and of salt that had lost its savour.

It is dangerous in religion to fall forward by overmuch zeal, yet not so dangerous as to fall backward by an unfaithful heart. The former may injure his face and lose his comfort, but the latter is in danger utterly to break the neck of his conscience, as old Eli by falling backward brake his neck bodily and died.³

3. She became a pillar of salt. Smothered with the sulphurous smoke of the volcanic flames, just as the elder Pliny was suffocated with the fumes of sulphur and bitumen at the destruction of Pompeii, she fell into a heap, and was gradually encrusted with the saline particles of which the air in the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea is still full. Such heaps, or lumps, formed from spray, mist, and saline exhalations which have gathered round a core of fallen trees or beasts are still common on the shores of that Sea of Salt, and always have been common. Josephus identified one of them with Lot's wife more than eighteen centuries ago, as the Arabs do to this day.⁴

It is peculiarly interesting to contrast the story of Medusa with its Hebrew parallel in Lot's wife. Both are women

¹ S. Cox, *Expositions*, iv. 290.

² A. Procter, *Legends and Lyrics*, i. 183.

³ John Robinson, in *The Pilgrim Fathers of New England*, by John Brown, D.D., 134.

⁴ S. Cox.

presumably beautiful, and both are turned to stone. But while the Greek petrification is the result of too direct a gaze upon the horrible, the Hebrew is the result of too loving and desirous a gaze upon the coveted beauty of the world. Nothing could more exactly represent and epitomize the diverse genius of the nations.

To the Greek, ugliness was dangerous, and the horror of the world having no explanation nor redress, could but petrify the heart of man. To the Hebrew the beauty of the world was dangerous, and man must learn to turn away his eyes from beholding vanity.¹

(1) The pillar of salt may be regarded as a *symbol of character*.—Lot's wife is not a pillar of salt in an Eastern land, but the expression of a life over which surges of its own past have gone till repeated acts of indulgence have formed into habit and fixed the character. The single acts seem so insignificant in themselves—the missing of opportunity, the clinging to little luxuries and indulgences. But the will is enfeebled, the signs of inevitable retribution are unnoted, and the judgment comes as a thief in the night.

In almost every case where they have found the remains of bodies among the ashes at Pompeii, they had some little bunch of keys or bag of treasure with them—evidently something which had kept them the few minutes too long. One I shall never forget. It is a woman's figure, lying as she fell, with the arm and the folds of her dress gathered before her face just as she tried to keep off the dreadful choking ashes, but all in vain. There she fell as she was running in the street; and the ashes buried her, and hardened into stone; and the body gradually decayed away, and 1700 years after, digging there, they found the hollow where it had been, like a great mould, and poured in plaster, and got the very cast of it, so that you can see the very expression of her face, and the folds of her dress, and can count the very threads of it. And see: in the skeleton fingers of one hand was found a little bag—just a few rings and brooches. She had only stopped for those. It would not take a minute. They were all on her dressing-table. Cannot you think how she would call out to her husband to go on with the children and she would be after him before he got to the city gate! But ah! when they got where they could look back safely, there was no mother, and no word of her, and never any word for all these centuries until the workman's pick came on that hollow in the lava. And now you see her with the little jewel-bag in her hand, for all the world like that old story of Lot's wife done into sad and startling fact.²

(2) The pillar of salt may also be regarded as a *monument of destiny*—a witness of righteous judgment. We are told to remember her; and when we recall her to our minds there is absolutely

nothing to remember about her except the solitary fact that on the way from Sodom she looked back from behind her husband, and became a pillar of salt. That is all; but that is enough for our Lord. It suits Him the better because it is so simple. The great issues of life are extremely simple. Religion may be elaborated and refined to any extent. And when it is, there is always a danger of our losing sight of the simplicity of its great issues. You have got to remember Lot's wife, our Lord means to say, because her temptation, her danger, is yours; because her fate might be yours too, possibly. You, too, have to leave Sodom, the city of sin, where also your Lord was crucified. The people of the city are wicked and sinners exceedingly. You do not love the wickedness, indeed—we have no reason to suppose that Lot's wife did, nor is it likely—but the wickedness is somehow inextricably mixed up with the beauty, and riches, and ease, and luxury of the place, with its soft enervating climate, and its wealth of fruit and flowers.

It has been the ambition of some men to raise a memorial column to keep their name in remembrance, and Absalom's pillar was long all that remained to him of that earthly glory to which he aspired; but with Lot's wife it has been like a burning brand once saved, but cast again into the fire, which smoulders on, and its smoke still ascends for ever. That desolate region marks the judgment that has passed; and continues to foretell the Judgment yet to come, looking before and after. As we read in the Book of Wisdom, 'Of whose wickedness even to this day the waste land that smoketh is a testimony,' and 'a standing pillar of salt is a monument of an unbelieving soul.' Nay, it is not now a solitary pillar; for in all the pillars of salt that mark that region of death some say, 'This is the pillar of Lot's wife,' and some say, 'that'; so much does her remembrance haunt and people the plain—nay, every country under Heaven. And all this on account of the awful mention which is made of her in the Book of God; that one short verse in the Old Testament, and that one yet shorter sentence in the New.³

(3) The pillar of doom in Sodom's vale, by way of merciful contrast, *suggests the promise given to him who 'holds fast' what he hath*: 'Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out: and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God: and I will write upon him my new name' (Rev 3¹²). Yea, surely, His new name: for with-

¹ 'The Gods of Greece,' in *Among Famous Books*, by Dr. John Kelman, 26.

² B. Herford, *Courage and Cheer*, 81.

³ I. Williams, *Female Characters of Holy Scripture*, 23.

out Him, and all the grace that is in Him, who could hope to become a fit pillar of that Temple? He helps us, not only to leave Sodom, but to be rid of the Sodom in our heart.

When wickedness is broken as a tree,
Paradise comes to light, ah, holy land!
Whence death has vanished like a shifting sand,
And barrenness is banished with the sea.
Its bulwarks are salvation fully manned,
All gems it hath for glad variety,
And pearls for pureness radiant glimmering,
And gold for grandeur where all good is grand.
An inner ring of saints meets linked above,
And linked of angels is an outer ring;
For voice of waters or for thunders' voice
Lo! harps and songs wherewith all saints rejoice,
And all the trembling there of any string
Is but a trembling of enraptured love.¹

¹ Christina G. Rossetti, *Verses*, 152.

LITERATURE.

- Aked (C. F.), *Old Events and Modern Meanings*, 27.
Alexander (J. A.), *The Gospel of Jesus Christ*, 88.
Cox (S.), *Expositions*, iv, 280.
Herford (B.), *Courage and Cheer*, 79.
Lewis (H. E.), in *Women of the Bible*, 25.
Mackay (W. M.), *Bible Types of Modern Women*, 213.
Mackintosh (H. R.), *Life on God's Plan*, 115.
Paget (F. E.), *Helps and Hindrances to the Christian Life*, ii, 62.
Price (A. C.), *Fifty Sermons*, x, 185.
Rawnsley (R. D. B.), *Village Sermons*, i, 215.
Temple (F.), *Rugby Sermons*, ii, 312.
Virgin (S. H.), *Spiritual Sanity*, 140.
Williams (I.), *Female Characters of Holy Scripture*, 23.
Winterbotham (R.), *Sermons*, 132.
Christian World Pulpit, ix, 344 (T. R. Stevenson).
Churchman's Pulpit: First Sunday in Lent, v, 344
(A. M. Mackay); The Old and New Year, ii, 380
(T. C. Williams).

Arabic Christian Literature.

By MARGARET D. GIBSON, D.D., LL.D., LITT.D., CAMBRIDGE.

I.

CHRISTIANITY must have been introduced amongst the Arabs at a very early period, possibly by one of our Lord's Apostles themselves. Wellhausen points out that *nasrānī*, the Arabic word for *Christian*, used chiefly in the Corān, must have been adopted before the Syriac word *mesheehāya* came into use; so that for philological reasons we are not justified in supposing that Arabia first received the gospel from Syria. Yet, once a spark was kindled, the neighbourhood of Christian Syrians on the N., and of Ethiopians and Abyssinians on the S.W., would help to fan the flame, and before the time of the Hegira the Peninsula was interpenetrated by Christianity. The great tribes of the Qudaā adopted it, and Nöldeke suggests that *Couri*, the battle-cry of the Gudhana, is in reality the Greek *κύριε*. Even to-day, the Bedaween of the Sinai Peninsula betray their Christian ancestry by making the sign of the cross over graves, and around their sleeping-places, to ward off demons. We may conjecture, from the child-like nature of the sons of the desert, that in many quarters outward symbols would be adopted, without any intelligent understanding of

their meaning, and that a long inheritance of heathen ideas and customs would predispose the Christian communities to heresies.

We shall begin our survey of Christian Arabic literature by mentioning what we possess in the way of translations of the Holy Scriptures. The Bible was doubtless early translated into Arabic, for the poet Al Birāk (A.D. 470-525) is said to have been taught to read it by a monk. Abu 'l Faraj (Ibn et Taib) speaks of an Arabic translation of the Bible, and says that the Patriarch Hanna (631-649) was told by the Emir Amr b. Sādb to translate the Gospels from Syriac into Arabic, leaving out the name of Jesus, and all mention of Baptism and the Cross; but on the Patriarch replying that he would rather die than leave out one jot or one tittle, the general gave way. In the Archiepiscopal Library at Diarbekr there are eleven MSS. of the Gospels, translated from the Peshitta; besides several commentaries, martyrologies, and sermons by Ephraim, Chrysostom, etc. We give a list of the principal Arabic Scriptures known in European libraries for which we are chiefly indebted to the work of Graf:—

1. Ps 77, 20, 21, 31-61, in Greek and Arabic. End of eighth century. Found by Dr. Bruno Violet in the Genizeh of a mosque at Damascus.

2. Job, fragmentary. Ninth century, brought by Tischendorff to Europe. British Museum, 261.16 (Cod. or. 1473), probably from Mar Saba.

3. The Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, in Cod. Sin. arab. 155.

4. Gospels, Cod. Vat. or. 13. Eighth century.

5. Gospels, Cod. K.I.I. 31. Mus. Borg. Congreg. Prop. Fid., probably from Mar Saba.

6. Cod. Tisch. xxxi. Ninth or tenth century. From Mar Saba. Two leaves, fragments. Mk 10¹⁹-11⁴. Mk 14¹³-15².

7. Cod. Sin. Arab. 75. Tenth century. See Mrs. Lewis, *Transactions of the Ninth International Congress of Orientalists*, ii. 96 f. Photographs of it may be seen at Westminster College, Cambridge.

8. A similar MS. in the Library of the Holy Sepulchre Church at Jerusalem. For others see *Studia Sinaitica*, No. iii.

9. The Acts of the Apostles and the Catholic Epistles. Cod. Sin. 154. Ninth century, edited by M. D. Gibson as *Studia Sinaitica*, No. vii. It is defective at the commencement, and begins with Ac 7⁸⁷. Dr. Merx believes it to have been translated from the Philoxenian Syriac, which it follows closely.

10. Four of the Pauline Epistles, from Cod. Sin. 155. Ninth century, edited by M. D. Gibson as *Studia Sinaitica*, No. ii., probably translated from the Greek, and in Ryssel's opinion, corrected from the Peshîta. The last leaves are lost, and it contains Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, and Ephesians as far as 1⁹.

11. Job. Cod. Tischend. Lips, made known by Gildemeister. Tenth century.

12. Fragments from the Pauline Epistles, made known by Tischendorff. A.D. 892.

13. Gospels, Beyrout, No. v. Tenth century.

14. Tatian's *Diatessaron*, as published by P. Aug. Ciasca, Rome, 1888, from two MSS., one in Mus. Borg., the other Cod. Vat. or. 14. The first is perfect. In the second, which is defective, the genealogies are interpolated by a later hand. The Jesuits in Beyrout possess some fragments of the *Diatessaron*. Although the Borgian MS. bears the name of Abu 'l Faraj (Ibn et Taib), the Beyrout one has indications of an earlier origin.

15. A translation of the Gospels in rhymed

prose, of the tenth century, preserved in Cod. Vat. or. 17 and 18, in Cod. Leid. or. 2348, the last being dated A.D. 993. The proper names are given in their Moslem forms. Guidi conjectures that this is the work of some Christian philosophers, who endeavoured to recommend their religion to their Moslem friends.

16. A translation of the Gospels, contained in Brit. Mus. Cod. or. 13, of the fourteenth century; in a Cod. of the Cathedral archives in Leon; in Cod. Monac. ar. 238 (or 41); in Cod. Monac. ar. 234 (or 40); and there is a fragment in a Tischendorff MS. at Leipzig.

The second of these (Cod. ar. 238) contains also an extract from Eusebius' Church History, and was written by the Deacon Abu 'Omar at Fez. in A.D. 1394, from a copy made in 1145.

Cod. 234, A.D. 1492, contains also the Penta-teuch. It is written by a Moslem. This translation was made from the Latin, in A.D. 946, by Isaac Velasquez of Cordova.

17. The whole Bible published at Mosul by Joseph David, 1865.

18. The Arabic New Testament published by the American Press at Beyrout during the last century is a masterly work, and far more scholarly than had ever been accomplished previously. It is the work of the late Dr. Van Dyck (revised by Nasîf al Yazîjî).

In the monasteries of Sinai and Mar Saba a number of Christian monks translated into Arabic the writings of Greek theologians, as well as Martyrdoms and the Lives of Saints. There are in the Library at Sinai about 350 MSS. of such works, which were roughly catalogued by Mrs. Gibson before the books were put into their present good order (see *Studia Sinaitica*, No. iii., Cambridge, 1894). The Mar Saba MSS. have been brought to Jerusalem, the collection as a whole being inferior to that at Sinai. There are similar Arabic translations mouldering in the Coptic monasteries in Egypt, namely: Deyr Antonius, Deyr Anba Bolos, and the four monasteries of the Nitrian Valley. The only ones which have been published from all this mass of material are:

In *Studia Sinaitica*, No. v., edited by Margaret D. Gibson:

1. Two recensions of the Anaphora Pilati, from Cod. Sin. Ar. 508, and 445.

2. The Recognitions of Clement, in two recensions, one from Cod. Sin. Ar. No. 508, and the

other from Brit. Mus. xxviii. (Add 9965). A.D. 1569.

3. The Martyrdom of Clement, also from Brit. Mus. xxviii.

4. A story called the Preaching of Peter, from Cod. Sin. Ar. 445.

5. Martyrdom of James, son of Alphæus, Preaching of Simon, son of Cleophas, and Martyrdom of Simon, from Cod. Sin. Ar. 536.

In *Studia Sinaitica*, viii.

6. Kitāb al Majall, or the Book of the Rolls, from Cod. Sin. Ar. 508; a story which had been published by Dr. Bezold of Munich in 1888 from the Paris MS. 76, under the title of the 'Cave of Treasures,' a translation having preceded it in 1883. It is imitated from the Syriac work, falsely attributed to Ephraim.

7. The Story of Aphikia, from Paris, Ar. 50.

8. The Story of Cyprian and Justa, from Cod. Sin. Ar. 445.

9. The Mythological Acts of the Apostles, from MSS. in the Convent of Deyr-es-Suriani, Egypt, from Cod. Sin. Ar. 539, from Cod. Sin. Ar. o, and from Cod. Vat. Ar. 694. Edited by Agnes S. Lewis in *Horae Semiticae*, iii. (Cambridge, 1904).

Other translations known in Europe are, according to Graf:—

1. A collection of Lives of Saints in Cod. Tisch. ii., Leipzig, from Mar Saba, copied by a monk named Dawud, at the end of the ninth century. It contains lives of St. Euthymius (d. A.D. 473), founder of the Mar Saba Monastery, of Mar Saba (d. 532), of his pupil Abramius, and of Theodosius (d. 629), was founded Deyr Dozi between Mar Saba and Bethlehem. It is supposed to have been written by Cyril of Skythopolis.

2. Cod. Vat. Ar. 71 A.D. 885. Lives of Saints, including Euthymius and Saba, Epiphanius of Cyprus, etc. It is by the monk Isaac of Sinai, copied from Antonius Dawud of Mar Saba.

3. A Tischendorff MS. in St. Petersburg, with remains of the Nicodemus Gospel. A.D. 885, written by Anton Dawud of Mar Saba, for Isaac of Sinai. This contains more than the Greek original about the Victory of Christ over Death and the Devil. The MS. contains also an account of a dispute between the Christian community at Sebaste in Cilicia in the time of Basil the Great and their Bishop Peter on the subject of his marriage.

4. Two theological treatises in Cod. Sin. Ar. 75,

one being about proofs of the Being of God from Nature, and the other Questions between Christians and Jews about the Messiah.

For others see *Studia Sinaitica*, No. iii.

As original we may consider:—

1. Five anecdotes of monks in Cod. Sin. Ar. 154 (ninth century).

2. A Treatise on the Triune Nature of God, in the same Codex. Graf thinks it is original, from its simple style, and the absence of philosophical terminology so characteristic of Greek theology. It is logical, but not polemical. It cites Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament and confirms them by quotations from the Corān. Published in *Studia Sinaitica*, No. vii.

Several Christian poets flourished in what the Arabs call 'the Days of Ignorance,' of whom probably the first in point of time (if not in merit) is *Al Barāk bin Rouhān*, of Yemen (b. A.D. 470, d. 525). As a boy he was a milker of camels and carried some of the milk to a monk, who taught him to recite the Gospels. This did not prevent his taking part in wars, first against his own tribe, the Rabeā, on account of the loss of a bride, and then with his own tribe against the *Tēy* and the Qudaā. By his prowess he acquired the chieftainship of the Rabeā, and delivered a number of captive women, amongst whom was Leila, the girl of whose hand he had been defrauded, and who was herself a poetess. She was afterwards carried off by a son of the king of Persia, but at the urgent request of her faithless father, the poet rescued her for the second time, and she then became his wife.

Better deserving of mention is *Imrou 'l Queys* (b. A.D. 520, d. about 565), who was the son of Hujr, king of the Beni Asad.¹ His youth must have been spent among scenes of bloodshed, as forty-eight of his uncles, some of whom were poets, were massacred in a hollow by Arab allies of the Persians. As a boy his predilection for writing verse called forth contemptuous anger from his father, who even thought at one time of putting him to death as a means of wiping out the disgrace. The irrepressible youth wrote:

When rhymes come to plague me, I chase them away,
As a boy drives a mettlesome steed in his play;
When they crowd round about, I pick six in a trice,
And among them I choose me one pearl of great price.

¹ It is not quite certain whether he was a Christian or not.

Hujr was treacherously killed by some of his own people, owing to a dispute about the collection of tribute. When the news reached the poet, then in his teens, he swore that wine and sport should be forbidden to him till he should kill roo of the Beni Asad, and cut off their forelocks. During the following night he witnessed a thunder-storm, and wrote a poem, a verse of which may be thus paraphrased :

When the moon o'er the land sends her radiance clear,
And the lightning is flashed from the cliffs' frowning face,
A rumour incredible reaches mine ear,
And shakes the firm roots of the hills from their base ;
Since the children of Asad have murdered their lord,
No gleam can I see save the point of my sword.

The poet's life henceforth was spent in going from one chief to another, seeking help for his vengeance, until both Al-Mundhir, king of 'Irāq and his suzerain of Persia, Chosroes Anoushirwan, sent troops in pursuit of him. He was encumbered in his movements by the possession of a number of ancient cuirasses, heirlooms in his family. His friends, tired no doubt of harbouring and helping him, advised him to try Cæsar, and to Byzantium he accordingly repaired. Justinian received him

with honour, and assigned him troops, among whose leaders were the sons of kings ; but his footsteps were dogged by a spy from the Beni Asad, who, gaining the monarch's ear, suggested to him that the Arabs are a treacherous race, and that the troops furnished to the poet might be turned against the Empire. Justinian thereupon sent to the poet the gift of a robe embroidered with gold, but plentifully saturated with poison, accompanying it with a gracious letter commanding him to put it on at once as a mark of honour. 'The poet obeyed, and in a few minutes dropped down dead. So say the Arab chroniclers, but Greek writers affirm that he died from smallpox on his way. It is not difficult, with modern knowledge of infection, to suppose that both are correct, and that Justinian's crime was only the crime of ignorance. The Arabs place Imrou 'l Queys in the very first rank of their poets for refinement of language and eloquence of style. Muhammad said that he would be 'the leader of the poets to Hell.' He furnished models of composition to his successors, even up to the present day. One of his poems is included in the seven Mo'allakāt, said to have been hung up in the Ka'ba at Mecca.

Literature.

THE MAN OF GENIUS.

DR. HERMANN TÜRCK'S lectures on *The Man of Genius* captivated their German hearers, and when published the volume containing them ran through seven editions from 1896 to 1910. The English translation (A. & C. Black ; 12s. 6d. net) was made by the late Professor G. J. Tamson, lecturer in English at Göttingen, from the sixth edition. The additions made by Dr. Türck to the seventh edition were translated by Mrs. Elizabeth C. Deibel. And the whole translation has been revised by Mr. George F. Payn, and other three scholars.

Dr. Türck has a theory. Its simplicity is its originality, and gave it its popularity. *Genius is love*. The more love the more genius, the more selfishness the less genius. For self-seeking makes one blind. The self-seeking man is the narrow-minded

man. But love makes a man clairvoyant, intuitive, a diviner of hidden things.

But genius is not simply seeing, it is seeing things in harmony. And so love is always there first. 'We do not love an object because it is beautiful ; it appears to us beautiful because we love it. For when we love it, we wish it to exist, and hence we shall notice in its outward appearance that, above all, which contributes to its power of existence and on which its existence depends, that is, the harmony, the vital co-operation of its parts. But again, on this harmony of the parts and their co-operation to produce a living whole all beauty depends, or rather beauty is this harmony itself, this unity in multiplicity, this order in diversity.'

Now this wonderful thing called love or sympathy expresses itself in all the experiences of life. Accordingly 'genius can be displayed in three direc-

tions, corresponding to the threefold attitude of man towards the outer world surrounding him. For firstly, man receives the impressions of the outer world; he perceives. Secondly, he mentally converts these impressions into ideas which he fits into the picture he has conceived of the world; he thinks. And thirdly, as a result of the impressions received and of the ideas he has obtained from them, he forms his resolutions and carries them out; he acts. Genius, objectivity, or disinterestedness in perception leads to the conception of the beautiful. Genius in thought leads to truth, and genius in action leads to the accomplishment of what is good, great, and of solid worth.'

Then Dr. Türck proceeds to apply this theory to the great works of genius and the men of genius, and shows how it explains them. His lectures deal with Hamlet, Faust, Manfred, Schopenhauer and Spinoza, Christ and Buddha, Alexander and Cæsar and Napoleon, Darwin and Lombroso, Stirner and Nietzsche and Ibsen, the myths of Pandora and of the Fall of Man.

Take one example: 'We now proceed to a consideration of the third way in which genius reveals itself in Hamlet's nature, namely, to a consideration of his objective, disinterested conduct. Up to recent times it has been a constant puzzle why Hamlet, after discovering the crime committed on his father, does not call the crowned murderer to account, or rather, why he does not immediately take revenge upon him, plunge the dagger into his heart, and have himself proclaimed king. I believe it is Hamlet's objectivity and extraordinary disinterestedness, his deep-seated conviction of the imperfection and sinfulness of all men, that leaves him free from the selfish impulse to seek personal satisfaction in the immediate execution of his revenge.'

THE BONDS OF SOCIETY.

Mr. John Sutherland believes that the only encouragement we have to do right is the claim that our neighbour has upon us. We are born 'in cohesion.' And we must maintain it. That is his ethics. That is also his religion. His book on *The Bonds of Society* (Heath, Cranton, & Ouseley; 10s. 6d. net) works its way through all our beliefs, and in the interests of this belief and with the aid of that new broom called 'modern thought' sweeps them out of its path.

In some ways Mr. Sutherland reminds us of Romanes—Romanes in his second and unbelieving stage. The following regret for the disappearance of belief in the efficacy of prayer is not so touching as the famous passage which Romanes wrote, but it is evidently sincere: 'If it is ordained that, in the course of knowledge we must lose our ancient faith in prayer, there is surely no man so callous and so hardened as to leave, without regret, the ancient home of our youth which is a mansion so stored with treasures—priceless treasures of poetic feeling and elevated thoughts, accumulated through the centuries, and prized more dearly by all that are worthy of their heritage than ever the material possessions gathered in a life-time were prized by one that lost his home and wandered, ruined and forlorn, upon the face of an inhospitable earth—that we lose ourselves in admiration whichever way we turn! All this we part from, and the aching pain at our hearts would crush the life out of us but that the long years of agony have raised up two champions in Fortitude and Hope, ever ready to support our flagging spirits amid even this the fiercest onslaught of doubt.'

Will Mr. Sutherland allow us to hope that a little more experience of life and a little more thought will bring him back his belief in the reality of prayer? It would be a joy to us as well as to him to find it so.

SOCIOLOGY.

The papers and addresses which Mr. Victor Branford has collected into the volume entitled *Interpretations and Forecasts* (Duckworth; 7s. 6d. net) were delivered or contributed at various times and under various circumstances. This gives the book an appearance of inconsequence and even of disorder. But that impression does not survive the reading of it. Beneath all the outward occasion lies the author's full knowledge of Sociology and strong faith in its future. His title is certainly apt enough; but his sub-title, 'A Study of Survivals and Tendencies in Contemporary Society,' is apt also, for it puts quite fairly the fact that all the papers dealing with the history of Sociological experiment in the past have this end in view, to show how the mistakes already made were made and may be avoided, and how surely Sociology, new as it seems to be, is really as old as civilization, and to be rightly understood and sent on its

beneficent way, must not be separated from its past.

Still, the great object which Mr. Branford has in view is to describe recent work in Sociology and forecast its future. Two new studies, he says, have been established—Eugenics and Civics. With their advent, there appears on the horizon a re-orientation, not only of sociology, that is, the economic and ethical sciences, but also of biology and psychology, the life and mind sciences, and even of physics and æsthetics, the use and beauty sciences. By adopting Eugenics and Civics into his scheme of studies, the sociologist has, more than before, a concrete basis and a definite objective as well as an orderly method, on which to invite—one may even say, demand—the full contributory co-operation of the cultivators of the preliminary sciences, biological and physical, who have hitherto, as a body, held coldly aloof from him. With this gospel of a Good Race and this vision of the City Beautiful, science may at length claim to complete its circle.

MARY AIKENHEAD.

Out of a vast correspondence there has been selected enough *Letters of Mary Aikenhead* to fill a volume of nearly six hundred octavo pages (Gill; 10s. 6d. net). They are true letters. That is the first thing to say about them. For their writer had no thought ever that even one of them would be printed and published. That we are told in the introduction: we can read it in every one of the letters. They are not public documents; they are private and confidential exceedingly. Yet never for a moment do they say things which could not have been spoken aloud; there is not a thought in them, or the least hint of a thought, that could not stand being proclaimed upon the housetops. As the editor truly says, 'They are the outpourings of the mind and heart of a great woman of God to those whom she felt and knew would not abuse her confidence.'

Why, then, are they published? Again the editor gives the reason: 'To those who read them it is a privilege and, let us hope, a great grace to be admitted into the secret workings of a soul so highly favoured by God, and to Irishmen and to Irishwomen there is added a natural feeling of pride in the fact that in holy Ireland Mary Aikenhead received the bright light of a Faith which she

kept undimmed throughout her long and eventful life. It is not without emotion and deepest thankfulness that one reads of those early years when, through the agency of her humble but pious foster-parents, God sent His loving message to her heart and planted in her soul that virtue of fidelity to His voice which was to be the guiding principle of her religious life.'

Here lies the whole interest of the book. To the uninterested the letters are quite uninteresting. To the interested they are the revelation of a soul which every moment of its life says to itself, 'This one thing I do.' With truly wonderful consistency Mary Aikenhead worshipped the Lord in the beauty of holiness. Known in the Roman Church as Foundress of the Congregation of the Irish Sisters of Charity, she may now be known more widely by her gentle, calm anxiety for the welfare of her Foundation, but much more for her devoutness.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

That Clemens Alexandrinus has something which specially appeals to the modern mind is made manifest by the issue in close succession of three books on him and his writings. The first was a little volume of selections issued by the Quakers. The second was a large volume containing Professor Patrick's Croall Lectures. The third is a work in two volumes by the Rev. R. B. Tollington, B.D., Rector of Tendring. Mr. Tollington calls his book *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Liberalism* (Williams & Norgate; 21s. net), which is just a way of saying what we have said already, that Clement makes a special appeal to the modern mind, from the breadth of his sympathies and his toleration.

We do not need to travel far through this entrancing book to find how modern Clement is, how very modern are the people among whom Clement lived. Here is part of Clement's picture of the fine lady of Alexandria: 'So elaborate is the dressing and braiding of this lady's hair that she hardly dares to rest her head for fear of disarranging it. As grey hair comes, it must be dyed, and sometimes artificial additions must supplement the failing supplies of nature. Her "making up" is a long process, rarely omitted, in spite of the well-known evil effects of cosmetics on the skin. Soot was used for the eyebrows, white lead for the cheeks, but even so the result could not stand the

light of day. As was her appearance, so was her way of life. The days of such a woman seem to have been empty and tedious enough. Among her crowd of servants are few whose occupations tend to the solid comfort of her household, but many who are skilled in the refinements of the bath or the toilet, and some who are clever enough to beguile my lady's *ennui* by silly gossip or questionable stories. It is like mistress, like maid, and with some of her attendants she would be amazingly familiar, in spite of her horror at the thought that, if she were stripped of her finery, she would look exactly like one of the menials in her pay.

'Her pets, too, were an important element in her establishment. Lucian tells an amusing story of a philosopher in some great lady's employ who was told to look after her favourite dog. A pup or a parrot, a peacock or a monkey, would receive lavish attention. Clement's remark that this solicitude might better have been bestowed upon the aged or the poor, is possibly still applicable, even in some nominally Christian households. At times, when the pets grew tedious, she would receive visitors, and the effeminate and immoral dandy above described was usually among their number. It is a sorry but probably a true picture of a woman's life. In a later chapter we may see that, even for pagan womanhood, it was a one-sided and partial representation of the facts. Again, we must remind ourselves that Clement says the worst he can; he is speaking of women, and "*corruptio optimae pessima*."

But there were finer ladies than these. Clement is not the man to make us enjoy his description of the evil elements in society and yawn over his account of the good. He is more interested even in the dress of the Christian ladies than in that of the pagan. This is Mr. Tollington's briefer résumé: 'Their clothing is white, like the men's, but of softer texture and more full in style. They wear white shoes. Out of doors they are veiled. They do not pay high prices when inexpensive materials will suffice. Their faces are free from cosmetics, as their clothing is free from dyes of rose, green, scarlet, purple, for "life is not a show." Unguents are not wholly forbidden them. Their hair, which is all their own, is fastened by a simple brooch. Like the men, they never hide their years. In the bearing of such a woman there is nothing loose or artificial; it is characterised by naturalness, grace, simplicity, and entire control.'

All this is lively enough. But Mr. Tollington is lively throughout. He makes Clement's theology as fascinating as Clement's Christian women. And from first to last he remembers his own resolve to show us a liberal Christian of the second century as a model for all advanced Christians of the twentieth.

The study of the English Bible will be taken up by the theological colleges some day, we believe. Meantime there are many Bible Study Circles and other agencies of the kind at work. And, in America, there are professors who condescend so far. One of them is a most competent teacher, and an enthusiast in the subject—Dr. L. M. Sweet, Professor of Christian Theology and Apologetics in the Bible Teachers Training School, New York. Professor Sweet has published a book and called it *The Study of the English Bible* (New York: Association Press; \$1). He advocates the study of the Bible by its words, by its structure, book by book, and by historical periods. And in every chapter he proves that he knows his subject as well as the literature of it.

In the discussion of reunion one preliminary question has been unaccountably passed over. Is union (not unity) possible? Does any institutional religion exist without sects? Can such a religion continue self-contained? That is the question which Mr. A. C. Bouquet, M.A., has set himself to answer in a book which he calls *An Introduction to the Study of Efforts at Christian Reunion* (Cambridge: Heffer; 3s. 6d net). The study is historical and dispassionate. The conclusion is that, while Christianity shares in the vicissitudes of all institutional religions, it nevertheless shows signs of triumphing over them (just as it shows signs of triumphing in the moral sphere, inducing internationalism to such an extent that the world seems likely to grow to a unity sooner than the Church), and causing a loose federation of Christian communities to supersede the decadent Latin imperialism of the Mediterranean Church.

A volume of sermons selected from the MSS. of the late Robert Killip, F.R.A.S., has been published by Mr. Kelly, under the title of *Citizens of the Universe* (3s. 6d. net). Dr. Maldwyn Hughes writes a Foreword to the volume, in which he tells us that

early in his ministry Mr. Killip 'registered a vow to consecrate his life to the task of delivering his fellow Methodists from the tyranny of set phrases, and of seeking to give them a larger conception of the gospel.' Every sermon is evidence that that vow was kept, for every sermon is as large-minded as it is open-hearted, and as fresh as if it were written yesterday. And yet how different is all this from that 'breadth of the gospel' which leaves out the gospel.

The most painful aspect of the Criticism of the Bible is its bearing on the work of the Missionary. That aspect is handled both frankly and wisely by Principal A. E. Garvie in *The Missionary Obligation* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. net). The full title is *The Missionary Obligation in the Light of the Changes of Modern Thought*. For it is not the Criticism of the Bible only that has caused disquiet; there are other movements to be appraised, such as the comparative study of Religion. This book will arrest and allay suspicion, if fairly read. It will do more, it will give new impulse to the missionary motive.

A series of lectures on health was delivered by celebrated London doctors at the Central Y.M.C.A., London, and they are now published in a small volume with the title *How to Keep Fit* (Jarrold; 1s. net). The subjects are of the most urgent necessity, and these eminent physicians have spoken out—Dr. W. McAdam Eccles on Alcohol, Sir Robert W. Burnet on Diet, Sir Dyce Duckworth on Clean-Mindedness, Sir R. Douglas Powell on Discipline, Sir G. H. Savage on a Sound Mind in a Sound Body, Dr. James Cantlie on Dress, and Sir Francis H. Champneys on Chastity.

The Book of Ruth, printed in unpointed Hebrew, as a text-book for study, may be had at the Manchester University Press (9d. net). It was prepared by the late Professor H. W. Hogg; the second edition is due to Professor M. A. Canney.

Never and Always is the title which the Rev. E. B. Wilson has given to his 'cure for care' (Marshall Brothers; 1s. net). It is 'never worry—always trust'; 'never hurry—always wait'; 'never murmur—always rejoice'; 'never be discouraged—always "press on"'; 'never faint—always pray.' What is the difference between fainting and being

discouraged? Discouragement, says Mr. Wilson, is the growth of a certain lapse of time, but fainting is the result of something sudden and unexpected. And that he may not faint, he often prays, 'Lord, prepare me for what Thou art preparing for me.'

A biography has been written of Deborah Alcock under the title of *The Author of the Spanish Brothers* (Marshall Brothers; 6s.). Great care has been taken by the author of it, Elisabeth Boyd Bayly, not only to find the facts of the long life in Ireland and present them fairly, but also to make the life itself appear worthy of a biography, so full as this. And she has certainly succeeded in giving us a book which it is a pleasure to read. Not once is there any flagging of interest. And this is the more surprising that the life was quite uneventful. It shows how little human life, in all that makes it good to live and good to read of, depends on outward events.

Those who are in the ministry in large cities are free to confess that their best workers often come from the country. Do they support the country churches as they ought? Dr. Edwin L. Earp, Professor of Sociology in Drew Theological Seminary, does not believe it. He has accordingly written a book on *The Rural Church Movement* (Meth. Book Concern; 75 cents net), to lay before them the case of the church in the country and encourage them to sympathize with a movement already begun and proceeding promisingly to make more of the Rural Church.

No man in our time has written more about prayer than the Rev. Andrew Murray. He does not write systematic treatises like those of the old divines. He sends his thoughts forth in small volumes, believing that buckshot is more disconcerting to the Devil than cannon balls. His latest little book, *The Prayer-Life* (Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d.), which was issued in January of this year, has already gone into a second edition.

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have also published a new volume by Mr. Philip Mauro. Its subject is *Baptism* (1s. net). It is divided into two parts; Part I. The Place and Importance of Baptism in Christianity; Part II. Concerning Household Baptism.

The Rev. Melville Scott, D.D., wisely pursuing

his studies in the doctrine of the Atonement, has now published the result of a study of Athanasius. The title is *Athanasius on the Atonement* (Stafford: Mort). What is the result of his study of Athanasius? It is to find that his own theory already published has been anticipated by Athanasius and therefore has the orthodox stamp upon it. In his last chapter he shows that this theory, though so old as Athanasius, is the most modern of all theories, and the most acceptable to our modern minds.

From the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches there comes a book on *The Land Problem for Christian Citizens*, written by Mr. Will Reason, M.A. (1s. net). The subject is in the hottest of hot water at present. But Mr. Reason is no partisan; and he knows.

Five of Professor Carl H. Cornill's most instructive lectures have been translated into English and published by the Open Court Publishing Company in Chicago under the title of *The Culture of Ancient Israel*. The topics of the lectures are—'Rise of the People of Israel,' 'Moses, the Founder of Monotheistic Religion,' 'The Education of Children in Ancient Israel,' 'Music in the Old Testament,' and 'The Psalms in Universal Literature.'

On the education of children he says: 'The foremost demand of our theory, that the individuality of the child must be allowed to develop, would have been as incomprehensible to the ancient Israelite as would have been the claim of woman to be an agent of the law. Obedience was the end and all. And since this is not apt to come of itself, it was necessary to resort to drastic measures. When we hear the proverb, "My son, despise not the chastening of the Lord; neither be weary of his reproof: for whom the Lord loveth he reproveth; he chasteneth the son in whom he hath delight" (Pr 3^{11, 12}), we need not wonder if the earthly father also lays ungentle hands upon his child for his own good. For "he that hath been delicately brought up from childhood will become a servant and end in misery" (Pr 29²¹—Such is probably the sense of the corrupt and difficult passage.)'

The Heidelberg Catechism in its Newest Light, by Professor J. I. Good, D.D., LL.D. (Philadelphia: Offices of the Reformed Church), gives us the history of the work done on the Catechism and its

influence during the last fifty years. The book is illustrated with a facsimile of the title-page of the original German edition and of the title-pages of translations into Latin, Dutch, French, Greek, Polish, Lithuanian, and many other languages.

The Rev. H. G. D. Latham, M.A., Vicar of St. George's, Camberwell, and formerly Dean of Perth in Western Australia, has published an Introduction to the Gospels under the title of *The Gospel according to the Four* (R.T.S.; 3s. 6d. net). The volume contains full and useful analyses of the gospel history.

One of the best of the recent histories of the Old Testament has been written by the Rev. A. R. Whitham, M.A., Principal of Culham Training College. Mr. Whitham has now written *A Short Old Testament History* (Rivingtons; 2s. 6d.), an abridgement of the other book, 'for the Junior Forms of schools and for the general reader who desires a plain summary of the Old Testament story from a Christian point of view without technicalities or discussion of difficulties, whether critical or historical.'

The Rev. Edward F. Wilson, 'late Principal of the Shingwauk Home for Indian Boys and of the C.M.S.,' has written a book to tell us what is *The Object of the Bible* (Stock; 2s. 6d. net). The object of the Bible is to inform the British nation that, being Israelites (they are the descendants of the Lost Ten Tribes), it is their mission to carry the gospel to the ends of the earth in accordance with the promise made to Abraham.

The Rev. W. G. Tarrant, B.A., has prepared and published a little book of *Home Prayers for Young People* (1s. net). It is issued by the Sunday School Association. Here is a prayer of thanksgiving for a holiday: 'O Thou Giver of happy days, for this day I bring my joyful thanks. Already its promises have made light my heart. Before I go forth, let my thoughts arise to Thee. Thy smile falls like sunshine upon all innocent mirth and healthful play. O great Friend of all little friends, may we all spend this day beneath that smile.'

'If any pain or disappointment comes, help us to bear it bravely; and may we quickly find new happiness instead. May I try to help all the rest

to be very happy. And when the night comes round again, may it find us all made more truly blest by this sweet gift of Thine.—Amen.'

The Dean of Canterbury has published a second volume of papers contributed to *The Record* on *Some Questions of the Day* (Thynne; 3s. 6d. net). The papers are divided into four sets: (1) National and Ecclesiastical; (2) Convocation and the Church; (3) Scriptural and Doctrinal; (4) Practical Religion.

One of the papers in the Scriptural and Doctrinal section is on the Inspiration of Scripture. It is a testing topic. Dr. Wace is proud to share the belief of the Primitive Church. He quotes from Professor Swete's *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*: 'On the nature and extent of Inspiration, ancient Christian writers speak with an absence of reserve which is not in accordance with our present estimate. The Holy Scriptures were regarded as the writings of the Holy Spirit; anyone who did not believe that they were spoken by the Spirit was counted an unbeliever. The

prophets were used by the Spirit as a workman uses his tools or a musician his flute.'

He then says: 'It ought surely to be felt that one of the gravest things that a Christian scholar or a Christian man can do is to adopt and to teach conclusions respecting the Scriptures which are, to say the least, not in harmony with these principles; and it is surely not less unquestionable that the views of the Old Testament which have of late been predominant in Germany, at Oxford, and at Cambridge, and those which are now being asserted at Oxford respecting the New Testament, are not compatible either with such a use of the Old Testament as was characteristic of our Lord and His Apostles, or with the view of the Gospels and the Epistles which prevailed in the Primitive Church.'

He admits, however, that 'the forms in which those views were expressed were in some cases too rigid and almost mechanical. The conception which some of the Fathers had of the method of Inspiration allowed sometimes, no doubt, too little to what has been called "the human element."'

Illustrations of Spiritual Truths from Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall.'

BY THE REV. G. A. FRANK KNIGHT, M.A., F.R.S.E., GLASGOW.

VOL. III. p. 4. 'Themistius justly observes that, in the recent changes, both religions had been alternately disgraced by the seeming acquisition of worthless proselytes, of those votaries of the reigning purple who could pass, without a reason and without a blush, from the church to the temple, and from the altars of Jupiter to the sacred table of the Christians.'

Are not Christians of this type still the bane of true religion? To-day they are found at a revival meeting, to-morrow in some place of amusement of the most questionable character. One week you see them seemingly 'filled with the Spirit,' the next you may discover them 'drunken with wine, wherein is riot' (Eph 5¹⁸). The inconsistencies, the time-serving, the faithlessness of nominal Christians, do more harm to Christianity than the open attacks of pronounced foes:

proselytes of this type are 'worthless acquisitions,' and true religion is only 'disgraced' by their lip profession of adherence to Christian doctrine. 'Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils' (1 Co 10²¹).

Vol. III. p. 20. 'In the government of his household, or of his empire, slight, or even imaginary, offences, a hasty word, a casual omission, an involuntary delay, were chastised by a sentence of immediate death. The expressions which issued the most readily from the mouth of the Emperor of the West were, "Strike off his head"; "Burn him alive"; "Let him be beaten with clubs till he expires." . . . The cages of two fierce and enormous bears, distinguished by the appellation of *Innocence* and *Mica Aurea*, were always placed near the

bed-chamber of Valentinian, who frequently amused his eyes with the grateful spectacle of seeing them tear and devour the bleeding limbs of the malefactors who were abandoned to their rage.' . . . (p. 65) 'His eyes, his voice, his colour, his gestures, expressed the violence of his ungoverned fury; and, while his whole frame was agitated with convulsive passion, a large blood-vessel suddenly burst in his body; and Valentinian fell speechless into the arms of his attendants . . . in a few minutes, the Emperor of the West expired in an agony of pain.'

'The tender mercies of the wicked are cruel' (Pr 12¹⁰).

'As a roaring lion, and a ranging bear; so is a wicked ruler over a poor people' (Pr 28¹⁵).

'To me belongeth vengeance, and recompence, at the time when their foot shall slide' (Dt 32³⁵).

'His mischief shall return upon his own head, and his violence shall come down upon his own pate' (Ps 7¹⁶).

Vol. iii. p. 30. 'The ardour of Damasus and Ursinus, to seize the episcopal seat, surpassed the ordinary measure of human ambition. They contended with the rage of party: the quarrel was maintained by the wounds and death of their followers. . . . Damasus prevailed: the well-disputed victory remained on the side of his faction; one hundred and thirty-seven dead bodies were found in the *Basilica* of Sicinius, where the Christians held their religious assemblies.'

What a commentary on 'By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another' (Jn 13³⁵)! and 'Doing nothing through faction or through vainglory, but in lowliness of mind each counting other better than himself' (Ph 2³).

Vol. iii. p. 32. 'The standard of the Heruli and Batavians fell into the hands of the conquerors . . . The standard was recovered; but the Batavians had not redeemed the shame of their disgrace and flight in the eyes of their severe judge. . . . The troops were solemnly assembled; and the trembling Batavians were inclosed within the circle of the Imperial army. Valentinian then ascended his tribunal . . . The Batavians were degraded from their rank, stripped of their arms, and condemned to be

sold for slaves to the highest bidder. At this tremendous sentence the troops fell prostrate on the ground, deprecated the indignation of their sovereign, and protested that, if he would indulge them in another trial, they would approve themselves not unworthy of the name of Romans, and of his soldiers. Valentinian . . . yielded to their entreaties: the Batavians resumed their arms.' They attacked the Alemanni with great valour, and routed the enemy before whom they had previously fled.

Are not defeated and disgraced soldiers in Christ's army still sent back to the field to retrieve their fallen honour? How many coward Peters have had 'another trial' afforded them by the great Commander, and in subsequent years 'approved themselves not unworthy of the name of Romans'!

'Back with thine angel to the field, and bravely do thy part.'

Vol. iii. p. 44. 'A valiant tribe of Caledonia, the Attacotti . . . are accused, by an eye-witness, of delighting in the taste of human flesh. When they hunted the woods for prey, it is said that they attacked the shepherd rather than his flock; and that they curiously selected the most delicate and brawny parts, both of males and females, which they prepared for their horrid repasts. If, in the neighbourhood of the commercial and literary town of Glasgow, a race of cannibals has really existed, we may contemplate, in the period of the Scottish history, the opposite extremes of savage and civilized life. Such reflections tend to enlarge the circle of our ideas: and to encourage the pleasing hope that New Zealand may produce, in some future age, the Hume of the Southern Hemisphere.'

Gibbon's conjecture has been amply fulfilled. The change in Scotland from the time when (if it was really the case) cannibalism was rife to its present foremost position among Christian nations is not more remarkable than that which has been witnessed in a single generation in many a group of the Pacific Islands. The frightful scenes of devilry and cannibalism in the Sandwich, Fiji, and New Hebrides Archipelagos have been superseded by the splendid triumphs of a rich and lasting

Christian civilization, which in many cases has produced men greater than Hume.

- Vol. iii. p. 59. '[The Goths] marched with the proud confidence that their invincible valour would decide the fate of the Roman Empire; and the provinces of Thrace groaned under the weight of the Barbarians, who displayed the insolence of masters, and the licentiousness of enemies. But the intemperance which gratified their appetites retarded their progress; a chain of posts and fortifications, skilfully disposed by Valens . . . resisted their march, prevented their retreat, and intercepted their subsistence. The fierceness of the Barbarians was tamed and suspended by hunger; they indignantly threw down their arms at the feet of the conqueror, who offered them food and chains; the numerous captives were distributed in all the cities of the East.'

'Let not him that girdeth on his armour boast himself as he that putteth it off' (1 K 20¹¹).

'The prosperity of fools shall destroy them' (Pr 1³²).

- Vol. iii. p. 69. 'The people, with their habitations, were swept away by the waters; and the city of Alexandria annually commemorated the fatal day on which fifty thousand persons had lost their lives in the inundation. . . . Their affrighted imagination enlarged the real extent of a momentary evil. They recollected the preceding earthquakes, which had subverted the cities of Palestine and Bithynia; they considered these alarming strokes as the prelude only of still more dreadful calamities, and their fearful vanity was disposed to confound the symptoms of a declining empire and a sinking world.'

'When ye shall hear of wars and tumults, be not terrified . . . Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be great earthquakes, and in divers places famines and pestilences' (Lk 21⁹⁻¹¹).

- Vol. iii. p. 90. 'A naked scymetar, fixed in the ground, was the only object of their [the Alani's] religious worship.'

These savages are not the only persons who have made a god of war, and 'in the love of arms, considered war and rapine as the pleasure, and the glory of mankind.' We read in Dn 11³⁸ of one who 'in his estate

shall honour the God of forces' (R.V. 'the God of fortresses'); and in the course of much modern history, it is easy to discover individuals, e.g. Napoleon, whose whole religion was little above that of these wild Alani. 'A naked scymetar,' the power of the sword, and the achievements which the sword can accomplish, formed their working religion from day to day.

- Vol. iii. p. 97. 'At this important crisis, the military government of Thrace was exercised by Lupicinus and Maximus, in whose venal minds the slightest hope of private emolument outweighed every consideration of public advantage . . . The vilest food was sold [to the Goths] at an extravagant price; and, in the room of wholesome and substantial provisions, the markets were filled with the flesh of dogs, and of unclean animals, who had died of disease.' The Goths revolted; in their rebellion the Emperor Valens perished, and the Empire was shaken to its foundations.

Here, as so often in the history of the Empire, is exemplified the nemesis of sin. These two worthless generals acted as if it were 'sport to a fool to do mischief' (Pr 10²³), but they discovered that 'evil pursueth sinners' (Pr 13²¹), that 'the house of the wicked shall be overthrown' (Pr 14¹¹), that 'he that is greedy of gain troubleth his own house' (Pr 15²⁷), for 'the crimes of Lupicinus were expiated by the ruin of the peaceful husbandmen of Thrace, the conflagration of their villages, and the massacre, or captivity, of their innocent families' (p. 101).

- Vol. iii. p. 112. 'Valens was removed from the field of battle to a neighbouring cottage, where they attempted to dress his wound and to provide for his future safety. But this humble retreat was instantly surrounded by the enemy; they tried to force the door; they were provoked by a discharge of arrows from the roof, till at length, impatient of delay, they set fire to a pile of dry faggots, and consumed the cottage with the Roman Emperor and his train. Valens perished in the flames.'

Such was the end of one who had been an undisputed despot, a jealous tyrant, and a cruel persecutor of the Trinitarian party. His death illustrates the sayings, 'Riches profit not in the day of wrath' (Pr 11⁴); 'His mischief

shall return upon his own head, and his violence shall come down upon his own pate' (Ps 7¹⁶); and 'Verily there is a God that judgeth in the earth' (Ps 58¹¹).

Vol. iii. p. 127. 'The funeral of Athanasius was performed with solemn rites in the capital of the East; a stately monument was erected to his memory; and his whole army, won by the liberal courtesy and decent grief of Theodosius, enlisted under the standard of the Roman Empire.'

A striking instance of the value of Christian chivalry. Theodosius' action in showing such respect for a fallen foe—an Arian heretic—induced the entire Gothic nation to lay aside old bitterness and to accept the rule of Rome. And not infrequently to-day sympathy and true consideration shown to outsiders in their time of bereavement have led to their abandonment of their antagonistic attitude towards Christianity, and to their hearty surrender to the claims of Jesus Christ.

Vol. iii. p. 134 n. 'Valentinian was less attentive to the religion of his son, since he entrusted the education of Gratian to Ausonius, a professed pagan.' How often this practice is copied by modern parents! They give over the training of their offspring to persons whose moral character is unworthy, or they allow their sons, at the most plastic age, to come under the influence of teachers who set a false seal indelibly on their nature, and yet they imagine that no evil results will accrue from permitting such soiling association! If much of Gratian's later folly is traceable to Ausonius' early training, many a man to-day exhibits a similar bent for evil as the result of the kind of education which his father allowed him to have.

Vol. iii. p. 142. 'Theodosius had lately bestowed on his eldest son Arcadius the name and honours of Augustus; and the two princes were seated on a stately throne to receive the homage of their subjects. A bishop, Amphilo-chius of Iconium, approached the throne, and, after saluting with due reverence the person of his sovereign, he accosted the royal youth with the same familiar tenderness which he might have used towards a plebeian child. Provoked by this insolent behaviour, the monarch gave orders that the rustic priest

should be instantly driven from his presence. But, while the guards were forcing him to the door, the dexterous polemic had time to execute his design, by exclaiming with a loud voice, "Such is the treatment, O Emperor! which the King of heaven has prepared for those impious men who affect to worship the Father but refuse to acknowledge the equal majesty of his divine Son." Theodosius immediately embraced the bishop of Iconium, and never forgot the important lesson which he had received from this dramatic parable.'

The 'parable' is an illustration of Jn 5²³, 'That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him'; and of 1 Jn 2²³, 'Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: he that confesseth the Son hath the Father also.'

Vol. iii. p. 154. 'The Priscillianists absolutely condemned . . . marriage; . . . they enjoined a total abstinence from all animal food.' 'Forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God created to be received with thanksgiving by them that believe and know the truth' (1 Ti 4³).

Vol. iii. p. 171. There was a wild sedition in Antioch, in which the statues of the Emperor were contemptuously thrown down. Theodosius imposed the severest penalties by way of retribution. The Imperial commissioners were sent to inflict the vengeance that had been decreed. But Chrysostom and others pleaded with the Emperor to pardon the guilty city. It was done. 'A free and general pardon was granted to the city and citizens of Antioch; the prison-doors were thrown open; the senators who despaired of their lives recovered the possession of their houses and estates; and the capital of the East was restored to the enjoyment of her ancient dignity and splendour.' 'A thousand new statues arose to the clemency of Theodosius; the applause of his subjects was ratified by the approbation of his own heart; and the emperor confessed that, if the exercise of justice is the most important duty, the indulgence of mercy is the most exquisite pleasure, of a sovereign.'

Is not this a faint reflexion of the joy of God in forgiving? He is Judge, and must correct,

and punish, and 'by no means clear the guilty.' Yet He 'pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage; he retaineth not his anger for ever, because he delighteth in mercy' (Mic 7¹⁸). And His forgiveness is made possible by reason of the great Intercessor, for whose sake, and through whose merit, pardon is made possible (Ro 8³⁴, He 7²⁵ 9²⁴, 1 Jn 2¹).

Vol. iii. pp. 172-175. The sedition of Thessalonica was followed by a treacherous massacre in which many thousands of both sexes were indiscriminately slaughtered. 'When Ambrose was informed of the massacre, his mind was filled with horror and anguish . . . He represented, in a private letter to the emperor, the enormity of the crime, which could only be effaced by the tears of penitence . . . He must not presume to approach the altar of Christ, or to receive the holy eucharist with those hands that were still polluted with the blood of an innocent people. The emperor was deeply affected . . . and, after he had bewailed the mischievous and irreparable consequences of his rash fury, he proceeded, in the accustomed manner, to perform his devotions in the great church of Milan. He was stopped in the porch by the archbishop; who, in the tone and language of an ambassador of Heaven, declared to his sovereign that private contrition was not sufficient to atone for a public fault or to appease the justice of the offended Deity. Theodosius humbly represented that, if he had contracted the guilt of homicide, David, the man after God's own heart, had been guilty, not only of murder, but of adultery. "You have imitated David in his crime, imitate then his repentance," was the reply of the undaunted Ambrose. The rigorous conditions of peace and pardon were

accepted; and the public penance of the Emperor Theodosius has been recorded as one of the most honourable events in the annals of the Church.'

'Bring no more vain oblations . . . when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you . . . your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil: learn to do well' (Is 1¹⁸⁻¹⁷). 'Will ye steal, murder, and swear falsely, . . . and come and stand before me in this house, which is called by my name, and say, We are delivered; that ye may do all these abominations? . . . Behold, I, even I, have seen it, saith the Lord' (Jer 7⁹⁻¹¹).

Vol. iii. p. 187. 'The effeminate luxury which infected the manners of courts and cities had instilled a secret and destructive poison into the camps of the legions . . . The soldiers . . . complained of the weight of the armour, which they seldom wore, and they successfully obtained the permission of laying aside both their cuirasses and their helmets. The heavy weapons of their ancestors . . . insensibly dropped from their feeble hands . . . they reluctantly marched into the field . . . they preferred the ignominy of flight to the pain of wounds . . . The enervated soldiers abandoned their own and the public defence; and their pusillanimous indolence may be considered as the immediate cause of the downfall of the empire.'

All this is a striking commentary on Paul's words, 'Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong' (1 Co 16¹³); and Eph 6¹¹⁻¹⁸, 'Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil,' etc.

(To be continued.)

Contributions and Comments.

Luke xii. 4.

'YEA, I say unto you, fear him.' Who is it that Jesus reminds His disciples needs to be feared? In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June of this year, p. 397, it is assumed that it is God. 'Is there

nothing in God to fear?' 'Yea,' says His Son, 'I say unto you, fear him.' Despite the number and authority of the commentators who agree with this view, the question must be raised, is the view tenable? We must note the following points.

(1) The fear in one part of the passage must

surely be the same kind of fear as the other part has in view, and that is fear of persecution, which implies a natural shrinking and dread. Is it conceivable that Jesus should say to the children of God (it is His own 'little flock' He is addressing), 'You do not need to shrink and shudder at the thought of persecution, but you do need to be so affected at the thought of God'?

(2) If it be God to whom Jesus is referring, the connexion with the verse immediately succeeding is not easily perceived. It sets forth God's loving tender care of His own, whose very hairs are all numbered, and Jesus Himself draws the inference 'fear not.' Does Jesus then mean 'fear not any painful experience life may bring, you are in the care or love of Him who notes a sparrow's fall, it is Him you have to fear'? Surely we cannot accept this, if there be possible any other interpretation. And there is.

(3) The parallel passage, Mt 10²⁸, puts it 'fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.' Now Rev 9¹¹ speaks of him 'whose name in the Greek tongue is Apollyon,' i.e. the *destroyer*. It is not God, but the power of evil that destroys men, body and soul. And God's children have real enough need to dread that power. If we so understand the passage, it becomes perfectly plain and intelligible. 'There is only one thing to fear, and that is evil, and never cease to think of it with horror and shrinking, it destroys in time and in eternity. As for persecutions fear them not, you are in God's care.'

This is in agreement with the view of A. B. Bruce (see *Expositor's Greek Test.* in Mt 10²⁸), and it must at least be admitted, that in face of the above considerations this passage cannot be used as a clear proof that there is 'something to fear in God.' I do not, of course, deny that.

W. D. NIVEN.

Blairgowrie.

Boanerges.

THE form and interpretation of this word still remain uncertain. The explanation recently advanced by Dr. Rendel Harris (vide *Boanerges*; Cambridge University Press, 1913), that the word is due to folklore, and means 'the twins,' is suggestive, but rather fanciful. We turn, however, to the form of the word, and suggest an explanation

which has not been previously offered. The literal meaning of the term is said to be *viol βοωνῆς*. The latter part of the word might stand for *רָנָה* (cf. Aram. *id.*, Targ. Mic 5¹⁵). But this word almost invariably (Job 37² a possible exception) signifies *agitation, raging*, in the sense of anger. The term might even arise from *רָשָׁף*, which is a Jewish Aramaic word meaning *flame, lightning*, and so become associated with *thunder*, but this cannot be pressed. The term *בְּנֵי רָשָׁף* is rendered 'sparks' (R.V. marg., 'sons of flame,' Job 5⁷). That a word meaning 'lightning' can come to be used in the sense of 'thunder' is indicated by the word *בָּרָק*, Syr. *ܒܪܩܐ*, 'lightning' (Dn 10⁶). We find the compound *בְּנֵי בָרָק* (Jos 19⁴⁵), lit. 'sons of lightning,' but perhaps = 'sons of thunder,' i.e. of the storm-god Rimmon (cf. Assy. *Ramman-birku*). It is suggestive that Barak was called 'thunder-bolt' (*fulmen*; Cicero, *Pro Balbo*, xv.), just as the father of Hannibal was surnamed 'Barcas' (the Punic name for 'thunder') among the Carthaginians (vide Nepos, *Hamilcar*, i. 1). It is tempting to look with Jerome to *רָעַם*, but it is not easy to obtain *reges* or *erges* from this term. On the whole it is best to turn to *רָנָה*, the root idea of which is *to make a vehement noise* (cf. Ps 2¹), though found with a somewhat different meaning in Aphel (Dn 6⁷). A similar word is found in Arabic *رَجَسَ*, *rajasa*, and is the same in meaning as the Syriac *ܪܝܨܐ*, *to sound aloud*, hence *to thunder*. This word is well known in the Talmud, both as verb *רָנָה*, *to shout tumultuously*, and as substantive *רָשָׁף*, *Geräusch, noise, storm*.

The former part of the word is still more difficult to explain. The quasi-diphthong *oa* constitutes the problem. Either vowel by itself would be capable of some tolerable explanation. It is always easy to cut the knot by suggesting a textual corruption or redactional error, and this of course may be the case in the present instance. But the reading *βοωνῆς* is well supported, and must not be hastily emended. Dalman says: 'If Mark really wrote *oa*, his unfamiliarity with Aramaic was the cause' (*Words*, p. 49 n.). The suggestion here made is that if Mark really wrote *oa*, vernacular pronunciation was the cause. It is well known that in Galilee the vowel sounds were very broadly and inaccurately enunciated. It is probable that the short vowel sound, *sheva*, in many words was

sounded not as *a* or *o*, but as an inexact blending or slurring of the two letters. The sound consequently could best be represented by the juxtaposition of the two vowels. For the variants in the *sheva* sound compare *הֶחֱבֵה*, which the LXX transliterate *Ποσβῶθ*, i.e. *sheva* = *o* (Gn 10¹¹); *רֶחֱבִיָּה*, which the LXX transliterate *Ραβία*, i.e. *sheva* = *a* (1 Ch 23¹⁷). Other confusions in Greek versions are doubtless due to the variant and uncertain sounds of the Semitic vowels. For example, the word *תְּלִמִי* (Targ. *id.*) is found in LXX as *Θελαμί* (Nu 13²²), *Θολαμί* (Jos 15¹⁴), *Θολμί* (Jg 1¹⁰, *et al.*), *Θολμαι* (1 Ch 3²). Josephus has *Θολομαῖος* (*Ant.* xx. i. 1). The Codices A B have the additional forms *Θαλαμί*, *Θολαμαί*, *Θολμεί*, and most suggestive for our purpose *Θοαλμεί*. With this last form compare *רֶחֱבֵנִים*, which the LXX rather strangely transliterate *Ροβῶνμ*. The conclusion is that the broad *oa* sound is to be retained, and that it is due to vernacular (probably Galilaean) pronunciation. The author of the second Gospel is here possibly writing from memory, not copying a document, and wrote the term phonetically, so that *βοανηργές* may fairly represent the north Palestinian pronunciation of the Aramaic *בְּנִינֵשׁ*.

J. COURTENAY JAMES.

Harrogate.

St. John i. 29.

‘Behold the Lamb of God.’

Every Christian sees and welcomes in these words a reference to the Coming Death of our Saviour Christ as a sacrifice for sin. At first sight it is perplexing and even amazing that they should be the words of John the Baptist, that before our Lord’s ministry had even begun, John the Baptist should know and proclaim His sacrificial Death. It is especially wonderful when we consider that the Apostles themselves, after our Lord had died and risen again, after they had had the advantage of a long companionship with Him, still looked for a temporal kingdom (Ac 1⁶), a fact which implies that they had no adequate idea of the value of our Lord’s Death. We cannot be surprised that those who deny the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel should refuse to believe that John the Baptist uttered these wonderful words, and should regard them as the manifest invention of a later writer familiar with Apostolic preaching.

But by considering the life and character of St. John the Baptist, it may be possible to indicate by what steps he may have arrived at this wonderful faith, and how he may have been led on to recognize the great truth that our Lord would die a sacrifice for the sins of mankind.

John the Baptist had been marked out from the first as the forerunner of Christ. His preparation began in his earliest years. He was the son of a priest, born and brought up amid a sacrificial worship. Every day he would witness and perhaps take part in the offering of sacrifices. He would hear the details of the sacrifices continually spoken of at home, and spoken of in a reverent and devout spirit, as no mere ceremonial, but a true act of worship.

And if after witnessing a sacrifice, he turned to the books of the law, he would read that sacrifice was to be offered as an atonement for sin. It may be supposed that he accepted the truth of a real connexion between the sacrifices of the law, and the forgiveness of sin. He could not indeed have supposed the sacrifices to be directly efficacious, but his mind would be prepared to receive the great truth of a Sacrifice which *would* take away sin.

The loneliness of John the Baptist’s life in the desert for so many years would assuredly quicken his perception of Divine truth. It would help him directly by giving him time and opportunity for meditation on the word of God, and the work of the Messiah, whose way he had been sent to prepare. It would help him also indirectly by keeping him out of the way of the Messianic ideas which pervaded the mass of the nation. It has been said that a desert-bred man has no patriotism (Robertson Smith on *Amos*). If it is true of Amos, it is true of John the Baptist, and we may at least be certain that he was free from the pseudo-patriotic notions of a conquering king, which were cherished by Scribes and Pharisees.

John the Baptist was a great preacher of repentance. He had a very strong and deep sense of sin: he believed not only in its guilt, but in its mystery. Yet like every other preacher of repentance, he had a strong belief in the possibility of forgiveness. And if sin was mysterious, might not forgiveness be mysterious too? And even though mysterious, must it not be declared by an act manifest to all the world? In such a way as this, the mind of the Baptist might have been prepared for the mystery of the Cross.

It is easy to point out passages in the prophets which may have helped John the Baptist to the utterance of the words we are considering. Is 53¹⁰, Dn 9²⁴ will occur to every one.

Lastly, the events of our Lord's baptism must have had an extraordinary effect on St. John's mind. If he really saw the heavenly Dove, if he really heard the Voice of God Himself, it must have lifted his whole heart and mind to heaven, it must have quickened his perceptions of Divine truth as they had never been quickened before. And if at the same time he recognized to the full the lowliness and gentleness of the Christ, surely the title 'Lamb' is a title which might well occur to him as fitly setting forth these great graces. And if the title 'Lamb' did occur to him as an appropriate title for our Lord's gentleness, I think it may be taken for granted that he would go on to ask himself whether our Lord was not also the Lamb of the sacrifice.

Thus we see how many ways there are in which John the Baptist could come near the great truth of our Lord dying as a sacrifice for sin, till at last the Divine Light broke in upon his soul, and led him to utter the prophetic words, 'The Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.'

A. D. MOZLEY.

Oxford.

Lewisian and Curetonian Versions of the Gospels.

In our last article we tried to compare the evangelical quotations from the Old Testament found in St. Matthew's Gospel with the Lewisian and Curetonian Versions, and the conclusion of our inquiry was that, generally speaking, the Lewisian text is different from the wording used in the Old Testament Pshitta. If our attempt may claim a certain probability, the composition of the Lewisian Version ought to be assigned to an epoch not very far from the middle of the second century.

It would be useful to examine in the present study if we can find some linguistic proofs which would corroborate our assertion. In other words, if there are phonetic and morphologic features which make the Lewisian text more archaic than the most ancient Biblical and patristic writings that classical Syriac possesses, the above-mentioned date will receive a direct confirmation. We will

refer in the following lines to the numbers of our Syriac Grammar entitled *Clef de la langue Araméenne* (Leipzig, 1905).

By a general principle of Semitic Philology we know that the letters called 'silent' were once sounded phonetically. In order to fit the old spelling, the orthography used in our days maintains them in some words, but very often, in order to stand closer to the prevailing pronunciation of the majority, it eliminates them completely. This principle is to be applied to the Aramaic language in a far more accentuated manner (11).

Now, the Lewisian Version explicitly exhibits some radical letters which are generally neglected, in pronunciation and in spelling, in the classic Aramaic of the end of the second century and onwards. The occurrence of this euphonic aphæresis is frequent in the Aramaic verbs meaning 'to go,' 'to come,' in which the first letter is always eliminated in the *imperative mood* (215); but the Lewisian text maintains it sometimes in such a constant way that we are tempted to state that this letter *Alaph* was pronounced at the time in which our Version saw the light. See in Matthew's Gospel, 5⁴¹ 8⁹ 9⁷ 11²⁸ 19²¹ 21²⁸ 22⁴ etc. This morphological fact is found in a more curious manner in the verbs used in the two following verses:—

19¹⁷. *But if thou wouldst come to life, keep the commandments.* The *Nūn* of the verb meaning 'to keep' is nearly always eliminated in the imperative in classic Aramaic (137), as is generally the case for the verbs *Pê-Nūn* even in Hebrew. Our text, being very ancient, maintains this radical letter in the imperative mood derived from the aorist (207).

19²⁵. *And when the disciples heard it, they were astonished exceedingly, saying, Who then can be saved?* The Aramaic verb meaning 'to be saved' loses its *Iod* in the aorist and the tenses derived from it (135); this weak letter is maintained in the Lewisian text.

There are, too, in this newly discovered Version some very archaic Aramaic words to which we wish to draw attention:

4⁶. *And saith unto him, If thou art the Son of God, fall from here.* The word used to express 'here' is very archaic. The original letter *Mīm* found in it has been changed in later generations to a *Rêsh*, as frequently happens in Syriac. Philologically this word stands for *Hâ-Men-Kâ*; the classic Syriac is *Har-Kâ*.

8²⁹. *And they cried in a loud voice, saying, What have we to do with thee, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?* The form by means of which the verb 'to torment' is presented, if it be rightly transliterated from the original, is very ancient, and the first *Tâu* found in it makes us think more of the Biblical Aramaic than of the classic Syriac.

9⁴⁻⁵. *And (Jesus), knowing their thoughts, said to them, Wherefore think ye evil in your heart? Whether is easier to say, Thy sins are forgiven; or to say, Arise and walk?* In Syriac, what grammarians call 'logical neuter' (519) is expressed by the feminine gender. In these two verses the words 'evil' and 'easier' have the masculine gender as in Arabic. We deem that this syntatic fact in such a sentence is very archaic.

13⁵² 20¹. 11 21³³. *He said unto them, Therefore every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder . . . The kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder . . . They murmured against the householder.* In all these sentences the first member of the word used for 'householder' is contracted of the word meaning 'lord,' and not 'Lord' with a capital letter. The same spelling used in 20⁸ leaves no room for doubt. I think

that not many Aramaic scholars will contradict the statement that this morphological form is very ancient.

18¹⁷. *If he heareth them not, tell it unto the church, and if he heareth not the church, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican.* The word used in this verse to express 'church' is surely archaic, meaning more a 'synagogue' of Jews than a church of Christians or a congregation of any other kind.

An important question arises at the end of this study: if the date assigned to the Lewisian text, at least for the Gospel of St. Matthew, be possibly the middle of the second century or even some years before, then this Version has preceded the famous Diatessaron of Tatian, which is a production of about 170 A.D. Can we find in Tatian's harmony internal proofs for the confirmation of this hypothesis? If the answer be affirmative, has Tatian then used the Lewisian text? If yes, was then the Diatessaron written in Syriac? We hope that our next article will discuss this tangled question, one of the most interesting in the history of New Testament criticism, always more by the way of facts than of theories.

ALPHONSE MINGANA.

Woodbrooke, Selly Oak.

Entre Nous.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. Zia Bentley, Chichester.

Illustrations of the Great Text for November must be received by the 20th of September. The text is Ro 5²⁰.

The Great Text for December is Ps 51⁴—
'Against thee, thee only, have I sinned,
And done that which is evil in thy sight:
That thou mayest be justified when thou speakest,
And be clear when thou judgest.'

A copy of Dobschütz's *The Influence of the Bible on Civilization*, or Cohu's *Vital Problems of Religion*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for January is Phil 4¹⁹—'And my God shall fulfil every need of yours according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus.' A copy of Dobschütz's *The Influence of the Bible on Civilization*, or of Murray's *Jesus and His Parables*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for February is Ro 8²⁸—'And we know that to them that love God all things

work together for good, even to them that are called according to his purpose.' A copy of any volume of the *Great Texts of the Bible*, or of the *Greater Men and Women of the Bible*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for March is Ro 7^{24, 25}—'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.' A copy of Cohu's *Vital Problems of Religion*, or of Murray's *Jesus and His Parables*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. More than one illustration may be sent by one person for the same text. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.